

THE CHURCHMAN

JULY -
SEPTEMBER 1961

Contents

Vol. LXXV. No. 3
New Series

	PAGE
EDITORIAL	139
ESTABLISHMENT AND LIBERTY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND	
George Goyder, Esq.	142
THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE TODAY	
The Rev. Leon Morris, B.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D. ...	147
"THE DEVIL AND ALL HIS WORKS"	
The Rev. J. Stafford Wright, M.A.	157
A SYNOPTIC IRONY ?	
The Rev. Professor R. A. Ward, M.A., B.D., Ph.D. ...	165
THE IMITATION OF CHRIST IN I PETER	
The Rev. Stephen S. Smalley, M.A.	172
BOOK REVIEWS	
Eduard Schweizer : <i>Church Order in the New Testament</i> ...	179
Owen Chadwick : <i>The Mind of the Oxford Movement</i> ...	180
S. C. Clark : <i>Unity, Uniformity, and the English Church</i> ...	182
Jonathan Edwards : <i>Select Works</i> , Vols. II and III ...	182
E. Keri Evans : <i>My Spiritual Pilgrimage</i> ...	183
Anthony Tyrrell Hanson : <i>The Pioneer Ministry</i> ...	184
John M. Elphinstone-Fyffe : <i>Three Hours</i> ...	185
W. W. S. March : <i>The Comfortable Words</i> ...	186
Thomas F. Torrance : <i>The Apocalypse Today</i> ...	186
A. M. Hunter : <i>Paul and his Predecessors</i> ...	187
Markus Barth : <i>Was Christ's Death a Sacrifice?</i> ...	187
Guy Schofield : <i>Crime before Calvary</i> ...	188
Richard K. Ullmann : <i>Tolerance and the Intolerable</i> ...	189
Elizabeth Elliot : <i>The Savage my Kinsman</i> ...	189
David Bentley-Taylor : <i>The Prisoner Leaps</i> ...	190
John Webster Grant : <i>God's People in India</i> ...	191
Helmut Hoffman : <i>The Religions of Tibet</i> ...	191
Swami Aghananda Bharati : <i>The Ochre Robe</i> ...	192
Ed. S. Radhakrishnan and P. T. Raju : <i>The Concept of Man</i> ...	193
Brand Blanshard : <i>Reason and Goodness</i> ...	193
Cyril H. Powell : <i>The Lonely Heart</i> ...	194
Brian Hession : <i>Alone to Pray</i> ...	194
J. H. M. Whiteman : <i>The Mystical Life</i> ...	195
J. G. Bennett : <i>Christian Mysticism and Subud</i> ...	195
Fulton J. Sheen : <i>Go to Heaven</i> ...	195
W. Rowland Jones : <i>The Diary of a Misfit Priest</i> ...	196
R. E. Terwilliger : <i>Receiving the Word of God</i> ...	196
A. M. Stibbs : <i>Sacrament, Sacrifice and Eucharist</i> ...	197
James Buchanan : <i>The Doctrine of Justification</i> ...	198
Lin Yutang : <i>The Importance of Understanding</i> ...	199
Soren Kierkegaard : <i>Christian Discourses</i> ...	200

THE CHURCHMAN

Editor :

THE REV. PHILIP E. HUGHES, M.A., B.D., D.Litt.

The Editor welcomes manuscripts, which should be typewritten, double spaced, and on one side of the paper only. He cannot guarantee their return unless stamps are enclosed.

Books for review, manuscripts, and editorial correspondence should be sent to the Editor, at

7 Wine Office Court, E.C.4

Subscriptions and all business correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers.

Price : Two Shillings and Sixpence

Annual Subscription : Ten Shillings per annum, post free.

Publishers :

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS, LTD.

Writers in this Issue

GEORGE GOYDER is a member of the House of Laity in the Church Assembly, and Chairman of the Church Information Office.

LEON MORRIS is Warden of Tyndale House, Cambridge. His paper on The Authority of the Bible Today was given at the International Reformed Congress held in Cambridge last month.

STEPHEN SMALLEY is Chaplain of Peterhouse, Cambridge.

RONALD WARD is Professor of New Testament at Wycliffe College, Toronto, Canada.

STAFFORD WRIGHT is Principal of Tyndale Hall, Bristol.

Editorial

FEW great men have suffered more from misunderstanding and misrepresentation than have the Reformers of the sixteenth century. They have been variously portrayed as immoral monsters, charlatans, fanatics, innovators, and schismatics. In more recent years, however, the malicious caricatures that have for so long been in circulation have been largely withdrawn. Dirt befools those who throw it, and in any case historical falsehood cannot be sustained indefinitely. Consequently, a quite different portrait has been devised and put into currency depicting the Reformers, not as ogres, but as essentially good men animated by admirable intentions. Their features are no longer grotesque, but tragic—their tragedy being that they failed to perceive the sympathy and benevolence of the church in which they had been nurtured and which would fain have retained them in her bosom and encouraged them in their task of reformation. This portrait paints out, of course, circumstantial details which would fit in ill with the “benevolent” ensemble, such as the fierce persecutions with which the Reformers were pursued, the hostility of papal bulls and burnings, and the anathemas (still in force) of the Council of Trent. It is, in fact, but a further distortion of history, but more subtly so.

There is, moreover, a particular portrait of the *English* Reformers, widely accepted, the authenticity of which has now been critically questioned by a Jesuit theologian. (Evangelical scholars have never regarded it as anything but a fake.) In the perspective of this picture these worthies are portrayed as having repudiated, not the central corpus of “Catholic” doctrine, but only certain late medieval extravagances of a peripheral nature that had become popular in the period preceding the Reformation. In other words, it is a picture which seeks to persuade us that, so far as the English Reformers were concerned, no radical cleavage was involved, but rather that the shape of the doctrine and worship of the Church in England continued fundamentally unchanged. If this is indeed the case, it must be said that it is a situation which does not seem to have been grasped either by the papists who put the Reformers to death or by the Reformers themselves who chose to endure martyrdom rather than renounce the teachings which were characteristic of their position.

This picture has, understandably, found special favour in Anglo-Catholic circles, where the need has been apparent of some mode of interpretation which would legitimize the giving of an unprotestant sense to the formularies of the Church of England. Ever since the rise of Tractarianism in the last century the interpretation in question has been part of the stock-in-trade of Anglo-Catholicism. But, while it was undoubtedly the spread of the “Catholic” revival that caused it to prosper, it was not the invention of the Oxford Movement. It had, in fact, been propounded as much as two hundred years prior to the Oxford Movement by Christopher Davenport, a Franciscan priest (also known as Franciscus a Sancta Clara), who in 1634 published a commentary on the Thirty-Nine Articles the aim of which was to demonstrate that these Articles were susceptible of a meaning consonant with the teaching of “Catholic” orthodoxy. In the next, that is, the eighteenth, century the notion was given clearer definition by the French writer Le Courayer, and in turn it was eagerly appropriated by

the Tractarians of the nineteenth century when it came to their notice. Pusey, for example, quoted from the work of Le Courayer in Tract 81. But it was in Tract 90, of which Newman was the author, that it reached its fullest development. Anglo-Catholics who have been responsible for keeping it alive since then should at least have been warned by the subsequent history of Newman, who in the end was so little convinced by his own argumentation that he seceded from the Church of England to the Church of Rome—prior to this decisive step, as he himself confessed, “it was (his) portion for whole years to remain without any satisfactory basis for (his) religious profession, in a state of moral sickness, neither able to acquiesce in Anglicanism, nor able to go to Rome” (*Apologia pro Vita Sua*).

The crux of the matter was the interpretation of Article 31 which condemns “the sacrifices of Masses” as “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits”. The day came when Newman frankly declared (in his *Via Media*) that his explanation to the effect that the Article was directed, not against the official doctrine of the Roman Church, but only against popular errors, was “a mere hypothesis of the author of the Tract to serve as an escape from a difficulty”, and acknowledged that “what the 31st Article repudiates is undoubtedly the central and most sacred doctrine of the Catholic Religion”. In recent years, too, Dom Gregory Dix has spoken ironically (in *The Question of Anglican Orders*) of the temptation of Anglo-catholics “to represent Archbishop Cranmer and his colleagues as premature Tractarians”.

The hypothesis, however, has persisted as a foundation-stone of Anglo-Catholic apologetics, heedless both of the cautionary example of a Newman and of the damaging criticism of Evangelical scholarship. But now, at last, it may well have been delivered its death-blow by the publication this year of a book by the Jesuit scholar Francis Clark, of Heythrop College, entitled *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (Darton, Longman & Todd, 582 pp., 50s.)—a work of impressive erudition, carefully and clearly argued, and comprehensively presented. In surveying the history of the hypothesis, Dr. Clark draws attention to the “surprising influence” which B. J. Kidd’s small book *The Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice* (which first appeared in 1898) has had upon “eminent Anglican scholars, notably Gore, Darwell Stone, Bicknell, Srawley, Hicks, Mascall, and Dugmore, all of whom acknowledge their debt to it”. As he points out, “Kidd’s direct aim was to establish the Catholic orthodoxy of the 31st Article”; and this he endeavoured to achieve by contending that the use of the plural in the phrase “the sacrifices of Masses” showed that the Article was not intended to condemn “the sacrifice of the Mass” (“The distinction between ‘*sacrificia missarum*’ and ‘*sacrificium missae*’ is a real one; and thus Article XXXI denies, not the Eucharistic sacrifice, but certain errors and erroneous practices developed out of it”).

Dr. Clark has little difficulty in demonstrating that “the interpretation of the Reformers’ attitude to the Mass does not depend upon one phrase in one document”, that both the singular and the plural phrase were used interchangeably not only in Reformed but also in Roman writings, and that in fact “the English Reformers frequently referred to ‘the sacrifice of the Mass’, in the singular, in terms no less disparag-

ing than those applied in Article XXXI to 'the sacrifices of Masses'". And he builds up a massive case in proof of the fact that "it was not only defects in clerical conduct, in popular devotion, and in pastoral discipline that they were resolved to reform, but above all the very theology of the Mass, as hitherto authorized and taught in the pre-Reformation Church"; that "it was to the tree they applied their axe, and not merely to the parasitical growths upon it". The study of their writings exhibits that "the Reformation hostility to the sacrifice of the altar is connected, in a coherent pattern, with the basic Reformation doctrines of grace, of justification, of the Church and the sacraments, and ultimately of Christology". This can hardly be emphasized too much or too often; and we wish that all Anglican scholars might have a comprehension of the issues involved as clear as that of this Roman Catholic scholar.

Dr. Clark, indeed, adduces an array of evidence to prove, *inter alia*, that the Edwardine Reformers declared their conscientious opposition to the sacrifice of the Mass in unmistakable terms; that they had accurate knowledge of the authorized Catholic teaching on the Eucharistic sacrifice, and of how it was presented by their contemporary opponents; that they could not but repudiate this teaching, since it was in implicit contradiction with their basic theology of grace and justification; and that they denied any real objective presence of Christ in or with the Eucharistic elements, a denial which removes the foundation of the Catholic concept of the sacrifice, for if Christ is not objectively present in the sacrament He cannot be offered there.

Dr. Clark's attempt to exonerate the medieval Church of the various "monstrous doctrines" which have been alleged against it is not uniformly successful, but he amply establishes his contention that "a long succession of Anglo-Catholic authors have been misled into accepting a theory about the Reformation and the Mass that is historically unfounded". We concur with his judgment that, "despite the new spirit of conciliation and careful choice of terms, it does not appear that the essentials of the problem have been changed, and that the new comprehensive language about Eucharistic sacrifice now recommended to Anglicans may cover, but does not resolve, the basic doctrinal tensions". And he is to be applauded for his recognition that "the clear-sighted candour of writers like Bishop Neill, who are able to recognize the incompatibility of two doctrinal positions and to point out the reason, is more useful than the well-meant but undiscerning eirenism of writers who treat contradictory doctrines as complementary insights, as different emphases of the same truth, as different colours in one spectrum of Christian witness".

The desire to discover a *via media* between Rome and the Reformation has led to the invention of hypotheses designed, like Newman's, "to serve as an escape from a difficulty," which on analysis may be, and have been, shown to be incompatible with the realities of the case, but which unfortunately have for many years now been treated as factual and set up as a standard of interpretation. What is now needed is a fresh consideration of the crucial subject of eucharistic doctrine in the light of the plain facts of history and especially in the light of the infallible teaching of our Lord and His Apostles.

P.E.H.

Establishment and Liberty in the Church of England

BY GEORGE GOYDER

THE Church of England is established not only through its link with the State, but also because it is in a position to minister to every soul in the land through its several thousand parish Churches and full-time officers. It has, in addition, an established form of worship, established rules for its corporate life known as canons, and an established government by Convocations and Church Assembly. If we seek to maintain this machinery in face of the decline of church-going it is because we believe in the Church of England as a national institution, the existence of which makes it possible still to speak of England as a Christian country. Millions who rarely go to church in these days of competing attractions, available at the turning of a switch, yet continue to value and to identify themselves with the Church of England as the church of the nation. If they could only *visualize* the Church as a fellowship of Christian men and women joined in the worship of our Lord Jesus Christ and in service of one another, John or Mary, the ordinary lay person, might find it easier to come to church and belong to the fellowship or congregation of the faithful, which is what the Church in essence is. Hence the urgency of church reform, to bring home to ordinary people the nature of that unique fellowship.

The present system of church government is unfortunately not such a fellowship. It is divided between Convocations, Church Assembly, and Parliament. Authority is lost by such division. None of these bodies can speak with real authority for the Church of England today. The Convocations contain no laymen and as a result they are little more than a superior form of debating society for the clergy. From primitive times it has been a rule of the Church that its acts require the co-operation of the congregation in order to convey the authority of the Church. Lacking such co-operation, the acts of Convocation lack real authority. It is a mistake to suppose that the officers of a body can decide matters affecting that body without its assent, least of all in the Church of Christ. The primitive Church, according to Archbishop Benson, was the first representative assembly in the world, an institution "rich with the freedom and the order of the coming society".¹ Charles Gore wrote that "to co-ordinate the laity with the clergy in regulating the affairs of the Church is only deliberately to return to the primitive ideal of the New Testament and the purest Christian centuries".² The episcopal principle requires the acceptance of a hierarchy to safeguard doctrine, but the Church of Christ is to be a "hierarchy largely tempered by spiritual democracy".³ The whole Church is intended to act together, with no difference made between doctrinal and lesser matters, if she is to conform to her own apostolic ideal.

That ideal, as the 1902 Report on the Position of the Laity⁴ made clear, has been lost in the Church of England, and in losing it we have

lost the people. For the people have come by long experience to distrust professional authority and to recognize its limitations.

* * * *

The urgent need of the Church of England is to restore the people to their rightful place as members of the Body from which, by accident rather than design, they have been excluded. The Reformation in the sixteenth century was in intention a return to the primitive ideal and it was largely the work of the laity, carrying out their determination to reform the Church through Parliament.⁵ As a consequence, Parliament ever since has represented the rights of the laity of the Church of England. This trust was not cancelled by the creation in 1921 of a Church Assembly comprising an equal number of clergy and laity and the forty-three diocesan bishops. The Church Assembly's authority from the beginning was limited by the Convocations to legislative and administrative matters, and the definition of doctrine excluded from its terms of reference. Hence, on doctrinal questions and on matters which affect the constitution of the Church of England and its relations with Crown and State, the laity still speak through Parliament, which remains, by the act of Convocation in 1919 as well as by tradition, trustee for the laity in the Church of England.

Looking back to 1919, when the Enabling Act was introduced, we can see that the Convocations at that time blocked the return of the Church of England to a primitive basis of Christian government such as exists in the Church of Scotland, and in consequence left the authority of the Church weak and divided. Today the time seems ripe to complete the work for which Charles Gore laboured, to restore the Church of England to itself, and thereby to give it real authority in the eyes of the nation.

The way has been prepared by the thirteen-year-long process of canon law revision, the first comprehensive revision to be undertaken by the Church of England for three centuries. At the time of the Reformation the revision of the law of the Church was put in the hands of a commission under the eye of the Sovereign with equal participation by clergy and laity. Four centuries later, when the Archbishops came to address the members of the House of Laity of the Church Assembly about a new revision of the canons, the laity were informed that they had lost their rights but would be consulted as an act of grace. To this the laity replied by asserting politely but firmly their inherent rights as fellow-members of the Church, confirmed by the bishops in the Bishops' Book of 1537 (sometimes confused with the King's Book of 1543) and restated by the Synodical Government Commission of 1902 in the document already mentioned (*The Position of the Laity in the Church*). A new Commission on the rights of the laity was thereupon appointed by the Archbishops and it reported in the same sense as the 1902 Commission. The laity had indeed lost their rights but they ought to be restored. "What we are urging," the report said, "is that the laity should be given precisely that degree of power, neither more nor less, which the clergy in the Lower Houses of Convocation already possess."⁶

Because of opposition from some—although not from all—of its clerical members to the proposal to amalgamate the Convocations with the Church Assembly, the 1958 Commission came down in favour of

attaching houses of laymen to the Convocations, although this would have perpetuated the present complicated and dual system of church government. Opinion both amongst the clergy and laity since 1958 has, however, moved in the direction of establishing a National Synod to include both Convocations and the Church Assembly, whose clerical members are in any case the same. The meetings of the National Synod would be divided between debates concerning church order and consequential administrative and legislative business. The Convocations would continue to represent the clergy ; the National Synod the whole Church. The preparation of measures and canons, the revision of services, and other work of church government would be distributed between the two parts of the body, clerical and lay, as seemed best to the standing committee of the National Synod, and all such matters brought before the latter body for approval and authority. This Synod would probably need to meet less frequently than the present Church Assembly and Convocations. One or two meetings a year instead of three would probably be enough. There could be separate sessions of the Convocations, which would remain wholly clerical bodies and retain their ancient customs and procedure. But, in addition, the clergy would meet the laity in Synod to consider the canons and conduct church business. Thus the laity would be given the opportunity, which they do not now have, to hear and take part in discussion on church order, baptism and confirmation, marriage and divorce, liturgy, relations with other churches, and canons, along with the clergy of the two provinces. Such, I believe, is the pattern of the future. How soon can it be brought into being ?

* * * *

The Convocations are at present engaged in the redefinition of Lawful Authority. Parliament is soon to be asked to agree to a period of liturgical experiment to go on alongside the present statutory forms of service. But the Convocations contain no laymen, although liturgical experiment is the concern of the whole Church and not only of its officers. Clearly the right of experiment requires the right of lay assent. Thus the synodical position of the laity is involved in the request by the Church for more freedom to experiment and amend its services. From a spiritual viewpoint it is imperative that the people of God go forward together in amending their worship so as the better to preach the Gospel and to proclaim Christ's Kingdom to the nation. Parliament cannot wish to hinder the Church of England if it is united in that intention. It can, however, and in the writer's opinion should, see to it that the laity are given their proper place within the Church in the process of internal law-making so that according to the ancient principle of the Church of Christ nothing is done without the assent of the laity.

Does this mean that when a National Synod has been created by a fresh Enabling Act, the Church will be disestablished ? This is a possibility, as the Archbishop of Canterbury indicated in the course of his enthronement address, but if it happens it will be by the will of the State, rather than of the Church. The Church seeks new life and liberty. It does not seek a quarrel with the State, nor a divorce from a

marriage which goes back, not only to Norman, but to Anglo-Saxon, days. England has ever been a realm in which, as Hooker and Warburton saw, Church and State are allied in a common cause : the Church's function being to hallow the secular life and to act as a spiritual guide to the nation. It is not for the Church to deny the connection by turning its back on the State. It is always possible that the State may in future take some step which would compel the bishops to resign as a body from the House of Lords, such as the deliberate denial of the principle of Sunday observance, or of Christian marriage. Even then it would be for the Church to declare its position unequivocally and to await the result ; not to separate out of pique or distrust.

We sometimes, as members of the Church of England, risk giving the impression that we think England has fallen so far short of being Christian that the Church of England can no longer with a clear conscience remain in the same relationship with the State as in the past. This is to be guilty of confusing the English State with the English people. Insofar as the moral conduct of the people is concerned the Church's obligation is no less than that of the State. If moral standards have declined and are declining, it is the duty of the Church to proclaim God's law and His commandments to the nation. This, by general agreement, the Church of England has been failing to do since the war. Its theology of society is weak, its grasp of the connection between the law of God and the Gospel of Christ tenuous, and its general drift inward-looking and antinomian. The Ten Commandments, which F. D. Maurice considered as the instrument *par excellence* of national reformation, are generally left out of the Communion Service, watered down in the new Catechism, and brushed aside by the clergy as irrelevant and out-of-date. There is profound theological confusion about the relation of the Law to the Gospel. Men in training for ordination are no longer examined in ethics. In these circumstances the Church cannot blame the State for the national decline in morals ; it is equally the responsibility of both. Both have failed to give a lead ; the Church by the weakness of its preaching and prophecy, the State by allowing moral standards to be eroded in the interest of big business.

* * * *

It is possible to take an even less favourable view of the Church of England's discharge of its obligations to the people of England in recent years, although Church people may dislike and even resent what has now to be said. When ordinary people may be refused baptism, confirmation, or marriage at the whim of an individual priest who puts himself before the law of the Church of which he is a member, when the clergy forsake their centuries-old tradition of charity to non-conformists by barring the Holy Communion (a disorder for which the new canons provide a remedy), when the services, especially that of Holy Communion, are conducted in a manner inconsistent with the theology of the Prayer Book, the question arises as to whether the Church of England is any longer fit to remain in an official relation to the nation, if unable to regulate its affairs in a more orderly and charitable manner. These criticisms may be based upon exceptional cases but if they persist the time will surely arrive when the State will again be asked to make over

the parish churches and cathedrals to a re-formed and re-united Church more in keeping with the orderly traditions and faith of the English people as a whole. In these circumstances any attempted disestablishment of the Church of England would open up the whole question of re-creating a national protestant Church with the assistance of the State.

It is a mistake also to confuse the shortcomings of the people with those of the State. It is arguable that the State as such is not less but more Christian than it has been for many years. We have today a State pledged to full employment instead of one which tolerates the social indignity of millions without work, as in the 1930's. We have a State which tries to give every child some degree of equality of opportunity through a national system of education in place of the gross inequalities tolerated in the past, a State which honours justice and fair-dealing at home and abroad, a State which has divested itself of an empire since 1945 and today stands four-square for peace and the rule of law. Nor has the Church been as willing as the State to embrace those principles of representative government of which Archbishop Benson showed the early Christian Church to have been the nursery and progenitor. It is to be hoped that under the new Archbishops there will be a revival of the Church's moral witness and renewed study of the Bible. Until then the State's attitude to the Church might be to repeat the taunt, "Physician heal thyself."

In these circumstances three things seem of outstanding importance in the emerging relations of Church and State : (1) the Church should be able to speak with authority as a fellowship of all its members, and to do this it needs to have some form of National Synod ; (2) the Church must re-establish its moral witness to the nation ; (3) the Church must be prepared to speak out and suffer the consequences, not to precipitate a quarrel with the State by taking unilateral action leading towards disestablishment.

Can Parliament retain its trusteeship for the laity in the light of the emerging relationship of State and Church ? I believe it can and should. Members of Parliament still represent the ordinary layman, as Proctors in Convocation represent the ordinary clergy. Neither body by itself truly represents the Church, although each represents an interest that is legitimate and important in the Church and should when occasion arises be able to speak for it. Parliament, in addition, is a trustee for the comprehensiveness of the Church, and it is also the duty of Parliament to see that the standards of justice adopted in the Church do not fall below its own.

By setting an example of responsible government in which the laity fully participate and by desiring to reinforce its relations with the State, I believe the Church of England will best show its faith in the English people and lend support to those principles of representative government which the British have carried, along with their system of law, into every part of the world. It must always be remembered that this British form of government and law is rooted in the mighty acts of God in history of which the Bible is the sacred record and the Church of England the historic guardian. I look to see a re-established Church of England, united in loyalty to the Crown, with all its parts working in

harmonious concert, in co-operation with and at the same time in freedom from the State, episcopal, strong, embracing the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Baptist Churches, active in bearing the moral responsibility which the alliance between Church and State demands, to the glory of God and to the strengthening of His Kingdom on earth.

¹ *Cyprian*, by Archbishop Benson (1897), p. 174.

² *Essays on Church Reform* (1898), p. 8.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁴ *The Position of the Laity in the Church*, being the Report of the Joint Committee of Canterbury Convocation (1902).

⁵ Professor Neale has shown in *Elizabeth and Her Parliaments* that the 1559 Prayer Book was put through Parliament by the laity in spite of a hostile Convocation.

* *The Convocations and the Laity* (CA.1240), p. 26.

The Authority of the Bible Today

BY LEON MORRIS

ALL Christians agree that their ultimate authority is God. But to the question, "How is this ultimate authority mediated to men?" various answers are given. Broadly speaking, these reduce to three according as most weight is given to the authority seen within the believer (the consecrated reason, or the believer's experience of God), within the Church, or within the Bible. In practice we all give some allegiance to all three. Thus evangelicals who put their emphasis on the Bible come behind no man in their insistence on the full exercise of reason, on the necessity for a personal experience of Christ and His Spirit, and on the fact that the Bible must be read in the fellowship of the Church. Nevertheless, the distinction is a valid one. In the last resort what counts with the evangelical is the authority of the Bible, just as what counts with the liberal is the exercise of reason, and with the "catholic" the authority of the Church.



There cannot be the slightest doubt but that from the earliest times Christians have conceived of their authority as rooted in the Bible. The New Testament writers recognized that of themselves they were not sufficient, but they claimed that they had a sufficiency which came from God (II Cor. iii. 5f.). Peter said they spoke "by the Holy Spirit" (I Peter i. 12). The claims they made were not exclusively for the spoken word, for Paul specifically referred to the things which he was writing as the command of the Lord (I Cor. xiv. 37), and II Peter iii. 16 classes the Pauline writings as scripture. More could be cited. The men of the New Testament recognized that all that they did rested on the fact that in Jesus of Nazareth God Himself had become incarnate. The salvation He wrought was consequently God's salvation. It was a salvation that God commanded to be proclaimed to men. And God Himself was in the proclaiming as in the accomplishing of this salvation. His Spirit superintended all that was done. Before the apostles were taken away He guided them as they wrote words which should be authoritative for all that came after.

Nobody recognizes this more clearly than the immediate successors of the apostles. "As if by some providential instinct, each one of those teachers who stood nearest to the writers of the New Testament contrasted his writings with theirs, and definitely placed himself on a lower level."¹ They see in the apostolic writings the authoritative deposit of truth, and they make their appeal to it. It is important to be clear on this. There never was a time when the Christian Church appealed to any other authority.

Throughout the early centuries of the Church it is the same story. Appeal is constantly made to the Old Testament, and to the apostolic writings. It is true that Marcion rejected a good deal of what the rest of the Church counted as scripture, but this serves only to underline the fact that common to him and his opponents was a deep respect for the authoritative writings. The difference of opinion was as to how the canon was to be delimited. The Church found it necessary to repudiate Marcion, but the whole incident emphasizes the continued stress placed by all on the Bible as the supreme authority to which Christian men appeal.²

However, through the centuries the Church tended to extend her own authority and correspondingly to minimize that of the Bible. Respect was paid to tradition, though at first tradition was subject to the Bible, and when admitted was for the purpose of showing the teaching of the Bible. But teachers were alive and the Bible was not. Indeed, in time it really became a dead book, as people no longer spoke the languages in which it was contained. By the middle ages the Church as represented by the hierarchy, whatever her theory, was supreme. There was no appeal from her ruling. In practice the Church was now the supreme authority. But to exalt men, even holy men, in this way is disastrous. It led to the corruptions of the medieval Church, corruptions which included doctrinal error, liturgical obscurantism, and moral failure.

* * * *

It was the work of the Reformers to call men back to the Bible and to the faith that it teaches. They vigorously repudiated any idea that there could be a supreme authority other than God's word written. This brought determined opposition from the ecclesiastical authorities, with far-reaching consequences. Even the possibility (and sometimes the actuality) of martyrdom was not allowed to stand in the way of their witness to the Scriptures. Not many of them worked out in detail a doctrine of the authority of the Bible. The point was not really in dispute, for the hierarchy professed to accept this. The trouble was that in practice they denied it. But, though few of them had occasion to set forth their views of the Bible in systematic form, there is no great difficulty in ascertaining the main drift of the Reformers' thought on this matter. The following seem to be the important points.³

1. *God is the Author of the Bible.* The Bible is not a human product, but a book which has God as its ultimate Author. Thus Zwingli can say, "The Scriptures come from God, not from man; and even that God who enlightens will give thee to understand that the speech comes

from God. The Word of God is to be held in the highest honour and to no word is such faith to be accorded as to it.”⁴

2. *The Bible is thus Reliable and Authoritative.* It follows from this relationship to God that the scriptures are to be accepted as completely reliable. Appeal to them is final. Thus Luther : “ I will not waste a word in arguing with one who does not consider that the Scriptures are the Word of God : we ought not to dispute with a man who thus rejects first principles.”⁵ The quotation of individual passages, however, can never convey the strength of the Reformers’ convictions on this point. Their whole position depends on the Bible. They refer to it constantly. Unless it is reliable and authoritative, their position falls to the ground.

3. *The Testimony of the Holy Spirit.* A book of divine origin does not yield up its secrets to the natural man. As the Spirit of God is the Author of Scripture, so He is its Interpreter. Unless He add His testimony, men cannot understand it aright. Cf. Calvin : “ as God alone is a sufficient witness of himself in his own word, so also the word will never gain credit in the hearts of men, till it be confirmed by the internal testimony of the Spirit.”⁶ This is not the modern view that the Bible becomes the Word of God only as the Spirit is active in men’s hearts. Whether they hear or whether they forbear, it is the Word of God. But Calvin is saying that this Word of God has no effect unless the Spirit works in their hearts.

4. *The “ Literal ” Sense.* Men must not impose their pattern on the Bible, but understand it in its natural sense. Tyndale says, “ The Scripture hath but one sense which is the literal sense . . . the Scripture useth proverbs, similitudes, riddles, or allegories, as all other speeches do ; but that which the proverb, similitude, riddle, or allegory signifieth, is ever the literal sense, which thou must seek out diligently.”⁷ This rule excluded the fantastic allegorisms and the like which sometimes distorted interpretation of the Bible. The warning is not yet out of date.

5. *The Fathers are subject to Scripture.* The Reformers honoured men like Augustine, Jerome, and the other Fathers. But they make it clear that these are not to be reverenced in the same way as the Bible. There is but one supreme authority. Tradition cannot compare with it.

6. *The Church is subject to Scripture.* The Roman hierarchy claimed that men could not know the Bible without the Church, nor could they know the meaning of the Bible without her authoritative guidance. The Reformers’ stress on the witness of the Spirit flatly contradicts this. It is the Spirit, not the Church, that makes the message of the Bible real to men. The Church is no more than “ a witness and a keeper of holy Writ ”. Its functions are limited, for “ it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God’s Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another.”⁸

7. *The Scripture is Dynamic.* The Bible is not simply so many dead words. It is the means God uses to bring men to Himself.

There are many statements which emphasize this function of Scripture, and also which emphasize that the Bible gives authoritative guidance for living out the Christian life. No part can safely be neglected, for all is profitable (II Tim. iii. 16).

It was the achievement of the Reformers to rescue the Church from its dependence on tradition and to turn it back to the Bible as its authoritative guide. They highlighted the errors which follow when the final authority is rooted in the Church. They made the Bible the constant court of appeal, as it was their unfailing source of inspiration and strength.

* * * *

But the lessons they taught were not permanently heeded. With the "Enlightenment" there came a readiness to reject the supernatural and to depend on the reason. In biblical studies this led to liberalism. This movement had as its laudable aim the statement of the faith in terms that modern man can understand and accept. This is a duty which each generation must face. None may shirk it. But the liberals went too far. They were so concerned for modern man that in effect they gave him a larger place than they did the Bible. While they professed to expound the Word of God they yet found such a large place for reason that it became their real authority. Whatever did not accord with reason they rejected. And what they retained they interpreted not in the light of its original meaning, but in the light of the reason of modern man.⁹

But just as the Reformation put an end to the exaggerated emphasis on the Church so common in the middle ages, so in recent times there has been a reaction against the excessive veneration paid to reason. Two world wars have shattered the liberal legend of the perfectibility of man. And recent theological writing has shown up the limitations of the liberal school so clearly that very few care any longer to call themselves by this name. We are all "biblical theologians" nowadays!

This change is one which may be welcomed by evangelicals. It is good that the limitations of liberalism are so widely recognized.¹⁰ It is good that men are seeing once more that Christianity is essentially the religion of a Book, and that they are turning to that Book for guidance and enlightenment. It is good that over so wide an area the old terms of orthodox theology are once again being heard.

But it is possible to make too much of all this. Before we assume that modern talk about the Bible means that Scripture is being recognized once more as the final authority, it is necessary to ask not only what recent writers say, but what they mean by the words they use. For the uncomfortable suspicion persists that, while the terms employed may be impeccable, the meaning is not the historic meaning. The old liberalism may indeed have been pronounced dead, but the corpse is uncommonly lively.

The trouble, as conservatives see it, is that the positions favoured by recent writers seem in the last resort to amount to a renewed emphasis on subjectivity. Sometimes they boil down to an appeal to reason, and sometimes to religious experience, but these, and not the Bible, seem to be the final authority. Take, for example, William Temple:

oft-quoted dictum : " What is offered to man's apprehension in any specific Revelation is not truth concerning God but the living God Himself."¹¹ Now if no " truth concerning God " is revealed it follows that we apprehend the revelation by our personal experience of God. There seems no alternative. A similar highly subjective process is the divine-human encounter so typical of the Barthians. According to Karl Barth the Bible is not the revelation. It simply attests the revelation. It is " God's Word so far as God lets it be His Word ".¹² Emil Brunner speaks of man experiencing " the working of the Holy Spirit as a real utterance of God ", and goes on : " Only in this Word of the Holy Spirit does the Divine revelation in Jesus Christ become the real, actual word of God to man."¹³ For all these theologians' protestations about objectivity it is difficult to see how we are to understand all this apart from the individual's subjective experience of the Spirit of God. There seems no way we can know what is revelation other than by introspection.¹⁴

A favourite device in recent writing is to shift revelation from words to deeds, from the words of Scripture to the deeds those words record. As Leonard Hodgson puts it, revelation " is given primarily not in words but in deeds, in events which become revelatory to us as the Holy Spirit opens our eyes to see their significance as acts of God ".¹⁵ This view is certainly every bit as subjective as those we have been considering. Indeed, Hodgson himself admits as much, saying, " such objectivity as we have a right to expect will come as a result of scholars putting alongside of one another their various readings of the evidence, each saying to the rest : ' This is how I see it. Cannot you see it too ? ' ".¹⁶

But quite apart from this there is a critical objection to this view which is not usually faced by its exponents. A series of unexplained acts is not revelation. Some Hebrews escaped from Egypt rather against the will of the reigning Pharaoh, a certain Amos denounced the evils of his day, a peasant of Nazareth was executed by crucifixion during the governorship of Pontius Pilate. But these facts, of themselves, are not revelation. The great majority of contemporary people in point of fact saw no revelation in them at all. Some people still see them that way. For them to be seen as revelation, an interpretation is necessary. Orthodox Christianity has always understood that the Bible writers were inspired to give this interpretation. The revelation is in the recording of the acts and the inspired interpretation, rather than in the acts themselves.

Another common element in modern discussions is the idea that inspiration should be posited not of the Book, but of its authors : God gave to certain men a vision of Himself—but then they were left to write it down, and this they did with what faulty words they could muster—they are often wrong and their vision at best is partial—but this does not vitiate the fact of the God-given revelation, nor the other fact that the Holy Spirit enables us to see through the imperfect words something of the divine splendour. Let us hear the objection to this in the words of one who expressly repudiates plenary inspiration, John Baillie : " Nothing could be more artificial than to suppose that these writers were endowed with infallibility in all that they had in

mind to say, while the Holy Spirit left them to their own devices as to how they should say it. Hence on the other hand we should have no hesitation in affirming that inspiration extended not only to the thought of the writers, but to the very words they employed in the expression of these thoughts."¹⁷

In the face of all such theories as those we have noticed it must be insisted that it is only in the measure that we can trust the record that we can apprehend the revelation. If we cannot believe the record we cannot recover the acts of God, nor the inspired thinking of the writers. We are dependent on the Bible for our reception of the revelation. Apart from that we do not know the revelation. If the Bible does not give the revelation in trustworthy form, we do not have it in trustworthy form. Karl Barth may distinguish between the Word of God and the Bible, between a *Deus dixit* and a *Paulus dixit*. But we know the *Deus dixit* through the *Paulus dixit*, and we know it in no other way.

The trustworthiness of the Bible is differently estimated by different critics. Thus there are some things that Fr. Gabriel Hebert feels called upon to contend for. "If the Exodus story were not in substance true," he writes, "the faith of Israel about its vocation would be grounded on a falsehood; and the same is true of our Lord's resurrection."¹⁸ But other things, he thinks, are not necessarily to be accepted, such as Absalom's rebellion and the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch. Errors are to be discerned in the Bible, but only "provided that they are not such errors as would make the Bible no longer the Bible".¹⁹ Now this distinction between big mistakes and little ones is not made in the Bible (the author of the Apocalypse issues a stern warning against taking anything at all away from his book). Nor is it made by the writers of the early Church, nor by those of the medieval Church, nor by many in the modern Church. It is a view which has no claim to be catholic. And the great objection to it is the difficulty of knowing where the line is to be drawn. Fr. Hebert will not surrender the exodus or the resurrection. Others cheerfully abandon both. How are we to know what makes an error such "as would make the Bible no longer the Bible"? We are back in the subjectivity that characterizes so much of modern writing on the subject. The criterion is in the reason of the individual critic and there are as many opinions as there are critics. There is no real authority here.

In the light of all this it is very curious that theologians like Hodgson object to the conservative view that it demands from God the kind of revelation we think we ought to have, rather than being content to accept the kind of revelation God has seen fit to grant us.²⁰ The truth of the matter appears to be the other way round. The conservative is not *a priori* committed to any particular view of inspiration. He sees it as quite possible that it might be, if you like, a revelation in deeds, not words, or the curious mixture of truth and error that so many find in the Bible these days. It might be so. If God has chosen to give us this, then we can only accept it. But has He? Your conservative at this point refuses to manufacture a theory of revelation out of his own head. He turns to Christ and to Christ's

apostles, and asks what they have to say on the matter. He fears that the same cannot be said about his more critical brother. The latter makes no pretence of submitting to Christ or to anyone else in this matter. Rather he works out his own idea of revelation and interprets the Bible, including the words of Christ Himself, according to this idea. Not Christ's view of revelation, but that of the modern scholar seems the important one. And when we ask what authority such a scholar has for his view, the answer comes back, as it must come back, in subjective terms. This is the way it appears to Hodgson. There is no more final authority than that.

In view of the popularity of demythologization and the like, it may be as well to add a few words about symbolic expression. We are often assured that, while the Bible cannot be accepted as it stands, its language can be regarded as conveying truth in symbolic form. Under the forms of myth, legend, and so forth, deep spiritual truth is set forth. We are, it would seem, to reject the message, but to accept the faith the message expresses. Now it is one thing to use parable and the like to convey spiritual truth, and quite another to use historical narrative for the same purpose. Both are legitimate. But we must not overlook the difference between them. When I use a parable I am saying, "This illustration will help you see the way God works. It will help you to grasp my thought." The story does not convey information about historical fact. It conveys information, and is understood by all to convey information, only about my ideas. Its truth or otherwise is quite irrelevant.

But if I take an actual happening and say, "Here is how on one particular occasion the grace of God has worked in practice", then I am on different ground. Now I am telling you, not about my ideas, but about what God has done. I am telling you that His grace has worked in that situation, and reasoning that we may well expect it to work in others also. Now if it can be shown that my story is not true, my whole argument falls to the ground. If the grace of God did not work in that situation, we do not know whether it will work in another similar situation. My story may have beauty. It may even be edifying. But if it is not *true*, I have no justification for saying that the grace of God *does* work that way. It may. It may not.

The Bible has a good deal of symbolism and this must not be treated with wooden literalism. But it also has a very great deal which purports to be historical. It is concerned with God's mighty *acts*. It tells us what God has done. Every time we reject such a story we remove it from the sources of our knowledge of God and restrict it to telling us the ideas of the author. If what the liberal scholars say is true, we must do this often. But let us not delude ourselves. To say airily that though the story is not factually true it conveys a true meaning is to miss the difference between parable and history, between illustration and statement of fact, between "God's grace is like—" and "God's grace has been shown in—".



Evangelicals, then, are called to bear their witness to the authority of the Bible in a world in which subjectivism is rampant. For most

scholars, the determining factor in deciding what is and what is not revelation is reason, or else the outcome of a personal encounter with the Holy Spirit of God. There is no objective certainty. Indeed, many pride themselves on just this. They rebuke Roman Catholics for finding certainty in the Church, and evangelicals for finding it in the Bible. If it were the case that evangelicals began by clamouring for some absolute authority, and in their desperate search lit upon the Bible, there might be justification for the criticism. But that is not the case. As I have had occasion to point out already, and as others will do with greater force and clarity before this Congress is over, evangelicals do not hold their position on *a priori* grounds. Whether there is an infallible authority or not, they do not know until they find Christ teaching them so. Their crime is that they prefer to find their guidance in the words of their Master rather than in the assured results of modern scholarship.

It is especially important in the contemporary situation that evangelicals bear their witness to the authority of the Bible. Men have lost their best certainties, and in many cases are groping for an authority they can trust. One result of the work of modernists and extreme liberals has been to undermine men's faith in the Bible. Ordinary men do not trouble themselves with the qualifications the scholars introduce, such as that truth that is conveyed under the guise of myth. They fasten their attention on terms like "myth", and regard the Bible as of no use to them when they are seeking divine truth. And at the same time as trust in the Bible has been shattered, other troubles have arisen. The wars of our generation have shaken men out of their complacency, and we know that the threat of the extermination of the race by the release of nuclear energy is no idle threat. Ideological conflict and nationalist rivalries have made their appearance. In some places men are suffering the privations of want, and in others their moral fibre is being sapped by the insidiousness of prosperity. Thinking men are concerned, and they are looking for something better. There is a vacuum in the life of modern man and he does not know how to fill it. Man is not self-sufficient, and, for all his bluster, deep down he knows it. It is sufficient to point to the high incidence of mental breakdown to show that man is not able to cope with the conditions of life that he has brought about.

In these circumstances there is a special responsibility resting on believers to point men with clarity and with certainty to the only source whence their need may be supplied. The situation is complex, and a call to the true source of authority is not all that is needed. But it is surely part of the remedy for the plight in which we find ourselves. The fact that men flock to any crank who will offer the security of an authority shows that there is a sad lack, and that it can be filled. I am not arguing, of course, that because there is a lack of a sense of authority, therefore we ought to proclaim the Scriptures as such. I have already made it clear, I trust, that we proclaim the Bible as our authority because our Saviour, and the prophets before Him, and the apostles after Him, so proclaimed it. We proclaim it because it is true, and not because we think it useful. But the facts of modern life show that our emphasis is timely.

There are two further points I want to make. The first of them is that we as evangelicals have a proper concern for the question of authority, and that this matters more to us than does inerrancy. It is all too easy when we are caught up in the modern debate to be found putting our emphasis on the importance of contending for this or that passage and the way in which difficulties are to be resolved. This, of course, has its proper place. But I am suggesting that we are primarily concerned with authority. Our particular solution of a difficulty may not be very important, but it is important that men go to the Bible with a firm trust in its authority. Our energies must be concentrated on showing that the Bible is an authoritative Book, not on contending for a correct understanding of comparatively minor points.

The second is, that in our insistence on propositional revelation we ought not to go too far and overlook the present work of the Holy Spirit. There is a witness of the Spirit, and we do not recognize the truth of Scripture apart from His work within us. A too narrow insistence on the revelation of divine truth is apt to become a barren affair, lacking the warmth and power of genuine Christianity. It is well that, while we insist that God has made His truth known, we also make it clear, that the Spirit is at work when we apprehend the truth of God. In other words, while we contend for the objective character of revelation, we should not overlook the values in the spiritual experience which mean so much to our contemporaries.

God has spoken to man. That is the great truth behind our concern for the Bible. And because He has been pleased to speak to us we dare not neglect His Word. May I conclude with the challenging words of the Doctrinal Basis of the Association: "It is the confident hope of the Association that God will grant to the Church of this age the gifts of the Holy Spirit, in order that, in obedience to Holy Scripture, it may respond to the needs of this age, as our fathers in the faith responded to the needs of their age".

¹ B. F. Westcott : *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*, Cambridge, 1889, p. 57.

² Cf. H. J. Carpenter : "In all the doctrinal disputes of this period, the theologians appealed to the authority of the Bible as decisive ; it contained God's Word of revelation as the guide and standard of faith" (*The Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. C. W. Dugmore, London, 1946, p. 20).

³ In this section I depend heavily on the excellent article by Dr. Philip Hughes, *Westminster Theological Journal*, xxiii (May, 1961), pp. 129-150.

⁴ Cited by A. W. Renwick, *Evangelical Quarterly*, xix (April, 1947), p. 118.

⁵ Renwick, *op. cit.*, p. 114. In view of claims made that Luther had a light view of inspiration it is worth noting that he also said, "it is impossible that the Scriptures should contradict themselves, save only that the unintelligent, coarse, and hardened hypocrites imagine it" (*op. cit.*, p. 115).

⁶ *Inst.*, I. vii. 4 ; cf. also I. vii. 5.

⁷ Hughes, *op. cit.*, pp. 133f.

⁸ Article 20 of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England.

⁹ Since ordinary men do not have the leisure or the equipment for the sifting process engaged in by the liberals another effect was to elevate the place of the scholar. Cf. R. S. Paul : "the effects of Liberal biblical criticism have been to take the Bible out of the hands of ordinary Christians and put it back into the control of the scholar" (*The Atonement and the Sacraments*, London, 1961, p. 188).

¹⁰ Cf. T. W. Manson's lecture entitled, "The Failure of Liberalism to Interpret the Bible as the Word of God" (*The Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. C. W. Dugmore, London, 1946, pp. 92-107). He asks at what point liberalism took the wrong turning and answers, "the mischief was begun when the working hypotheses of natural science were allowed to become the dogmas of theology. At that moment God's revelation of Himself gives way to man's thought about God" (*op. cit.*, p. 101).

¹¹ *Nature, Man and God*, p. 322. He also says plainly, "there is no such thing as revealed truth" (*op. cit.*, p. 317).

¹² *Church Dogmatics*, I. i, Edinburgh, 1955, p. 123. Cf. I. ii, p. 537, "by the Holy Spirit the witnesses of His humanity became and are also the witnesses of His eternal Godhead, His revelation was apprehended by them, and through them it is apprehended by us."

¹³ *The Christian Doctrine of God*, London, 1949, p. 30.

¹⁴ Cf. E. G. Homrighausen : "Whether the Christian revelation is only personal and not to some extent propositional is another question, for if God reveals Himself adequately, man's mind must be satisfied" (*Theology Today*, i (1944) p. 137).

¹⁵ *On the Authority of the Bible*, London, 1960, p. 4. A curious illustration of this kind of thinking is seen in William Nicholls, *Revelation in Christ*, London, 1958, where the writer so emphasizes deeds that he mentions the Bible but rarely (except to denounce propositional revelation or the "fundamentalists"; whom he gives no sign of having read).

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 10. Cf. C. H. Dodd : "Not God but Paul is the author of the Epistle to the Romans"; "the words of the Epistle to the Romans carry just as much weight as we are prepared to allow to Paul as a religious teacher" (*The Authority of the Bible*, London, 1947, pp. 16f.).

¹⁷ *The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought*, Oxford, 1956, p. 115.

¹⁸ *Fundamentalism and the Church of God*, London, 1957, p. 43.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 139.

²⁰ *Op. cit.* C. F. Evans takes up a similar position : "we must also beware of any sentence which begins with the words 'Surely God would have . . .' for it is a religious *a priori* sentence. 'Surely God would have seen to it that the Bible would have been preserved from error.' 'Surely God would have seen to it that there would be an instrument on earth which would teach without error.' This is how the sentences run which are spoken from the embattled positions. But for all their impressiveness must they not be judged irreligious and heretical sentences?" (*ibid.*, p. 73; cf. D. E. Nineham, pp. 89f.) This would make impressive reading except for the fact that the orthodox do not, in fact, reach their position this way.

“The Devil and all His Works”

BY J. STAFFORD WRIGHT

THE solemn renunciation of the devil and all his works has been omitted from the proposed new Catechism. The omission has been taken to indicate a disbelief in the existence of the devil, and presumably of evil spirits also ; and indeed no other explanation is possible. It makes one a little frightened about future revisions of other parts of the Prayer Book and Articles. On the one hand there is the tendency to reinstate beliefs that were rejected at the Reformation as unscriptural, and on the other hand the tendency to repudiate scriptural teachings that have always formed an essential part of reformed and unreformed Church teaching, as in the case before us. Even if some theologians are agnostic about the devil, or actually “adiabolistic”, it is a serious breach of trust to impose their private judgment, even negatively, upon an official statement of Church teaching such as the Catechism. Private judgments tend to be ephemeral.

One generally assumes that disbelief in a personal devil is a modern phenomenon. Certainly Rudolf Bultmann treats it as this, when he uses his delightful *non sequitur* argument in his essay in *Kerugma and Myth* (p. 5) : “It is impossible to use electric light and the wireless and to avail ourselves of modern medical and surgical discoveries, and at the same time to believe in the New Testament world of daemons and spirits”. Since Bultmann wrote this, we have met a similar type of argument, that sputniks and artificial satellites have made it impossible for us to believe in God. It is true that modern thinking has been the compelling factor in the minds of the revisers of the Catechism, but the issue was there at the Reformation, since Calvin writes : “Having above refuted that nugatory philosophy concerning the holy angels, which teaches that they are nothing but good notions or inspirations which God excites in the minds of men, we must here likewise refute those who foolishly allege that devils are nothing but bad affections or perturbations suggested by our carnal nature” (*Institutes*. I. xiv. 19. Beveridge’s translation).

Emanuel Swedenborg, who claimed to have visions of the worlds of heaven and hell, maintained that angels and evil spirits are not any separate creation, but are men and women who have lived on this earth. The Devil is then a name given to a certain sphere of existence, and is not a personal spirit. “Hell taken as a whole is what is called the Devil and Satan. The hell which is behind, where dwell those called evil genii, is called the Devil ; and the hell which is in front, where dwell those called evil spirits, is called Satan.” (*Heaven and Hell*, published 1758 ; Everyman Edn., Section 311.) It is interesting to note Swedenborg’s explanation, in the same passage, that “the Christian world has formed an erroneous belief respecting the inhabitants of heaven and hell from certain passages of the Word, understood according to the sense of the letter only, and not illustrated and explained by genuine doctrine from the Word ; for the literal sense of

the Word, unless illumined by genuine doctrine, bewilders the mind and begets ignorance, heresies, and errors.”

Another who abandoned the literal sense of Scripture was Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy. Unlike Swedenborg, who based his teachings on his visions, she had to abandon the literal sense to square Scripture with her philosophy. “There are evil beliefs, often called evil spirits; but these evils are not Spirit, for there is no evil in Spirit.” (*Science and Health*, pp. 206, 207.) Similarly on p. 584 she gives her definition of Devil as, “Evil; a lie; error; neither corporeality nor mind; the opposite of Truth; a belief in sin, sickness, and death; animal magnetism or hypnotism; the lust of the flesh, which saith: ‘I am life and intelligence in matter. There is more than one mind, for I am mind . . .’”.

For some strange reason the Christadelphians, who began in the middle of the last century, also deny the existence of a personal devil, and go to considerable trouble to reinterpret all the biblical references. Their standard work by Robert Roberts, *Christendom Astray from the Bible*, defines Satan as “sin in the flesh”, while a recent booklet by S. F. Jeacock, *The Way of Life*, says: “We are all ‘devils’ or ‘satans’, in that we are in the flesh—in human nature. To assert that Satan is a ‘fallen angel’ is completely unscriptural” (p. 43).

* * * * *

These quotations show two things. First, that the denial of Satan’s personal existence has hitherto been outside the stream of Church teaching, and that now our Church of England is suggesting coming into line with the cults. This does not mean necessarily that it is wrong, since, when the Church as a whole neglects some truth, a sect usually arises to emphasize it. In this case, however, we are not concerned with a neglected truth, but rather with an interpretation that reverses the plain sense of Scripture. This raises the second point; if we leave the plain sense of Scripture, what shall we substitute as the proper interpretation? Swedenborg, Christian Science, and Christadelphianism have given three different interpretations; there may well be others.

Indeed, it is unlikely that the revisers of the Catechism have much acquaintance with these three viewpoints. At the moment the proposed Catechism does not contain any positive interpretation of “the devil and all his works”, so we do not know what is in the minds of the revisers, nor what suggestions will be raised when the subject comes before the Convocations. Would it perhaps be fair to quote Paul Tillich as representing an average point of view? “The truth of the doctrine of angelic and demonic powers is that there are supra-individual structures of goodness and supra-individual structures of evil. Angels and demons are mythological names for constructive and destructive powers of being, which are ambiguously interwoven and which fight with each other in the same person, in the same soul group, and in the same historical situation. They are not beings but powers of being dependent on the whole structure of existence and involved in the ambiguous life” (*Systematic Theology*, Vol. II, p. 45).

Here Tillich groups together angels and demons, and it is probable

that, if we find grounds for rejecting the one, similar grounds will lead us to reject the other. Emil Brunner is a curious exception. In *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption*, Chapter 5, he argues strongly for the Christian belief in Satan as an essential part of the Gospel of salvation ; but he is sceptical about the existence of angels, as being “theological hypotheses and nothing more”. Here however he is apparently in the opposite camp to Karl Barth. One must use the term “apparently”, since it is not at all clear what Karl Barth does actually hold about the existence of angels and demons, although he discusses the subject fully in his *Church Dogmatics* in Vol. III. Part 3. (pp. 477ff.). He accepts the ministry of angels as non-autonomous creatures, but refuses to regard the devil and his angels as being in the same category : “We cannot believe in the devil and demons as we may believe in angels when we believe in God” (p. 521). If one asks what they are, one is led back to Barth’s view of nothingness, “the being which exists only as it denies all true being, and is denied by it. Everything which had to be said about this element is also to be said of demons as the opponents of God’s heavenly ambassadors. . . . They are, but only in their own way ; they are, but improperly. Their being is neither that of God nor that of the creature, neither that of heavenly creatures nor that of earthly, for they are neither the one nor the other. They are not divine but non-divine and anti-divine. On the other hand, God has not created them, and therefore they are not creaturely. They are only as God affirms Himself and the creature, and thus pronounces a necessary No” (p. 523).

What emerges from this is that we may not attempt to formulate any angelology or demonology. Yet why should we not do so ? If we may study fallen and regenerated man, both in himself and in relation to Christ, and if we may study the world that God has put under man, why should we not also try to understand the nature of those beings who are said to come one degree higher in the scale than man, man being made “a little lower than the angels” and engaged in conflict with “principalities and powers in the heavenly places”? At the moment we are not concerned with good angels, but with the Evil One, whom the Bible reveals as the devil and Satan.

Satan is a subject of biblical revelation, as also is the nature of the Holy Trinity and the significance of the death of Jesus Christ on the Cross. Only too often people affirm and deny things about Satan which do not come from the biblical revelation at all. The essential picture of Satan in the Bible is so extraordinary that it is hard to conceive of its invention by anyone ; yet the picture is absolutely consistent in both Testaments, though it is inconsistent with Jewish ideas of the intertestamental period and with non-Jewish ideas of a god of evil.

The astonishing thing about Satan is that he has access to the presence of God, thus disproving the popular evangelical slogan that evil cannot live in the presence of God. In the first two chapters of Job, Satan comes before God with the sons of God, and accuses Job, not of sin, but of serving God simply for the sake of the good things that come to him thereby. He obtains permission from God to damage

Job up to a fixed degree. His aim is to make Job renounce God, and in this he fails. We may compare this with Christ's words to Peter in Luke xxii. 31, 32. The Greek word may fairly be translated, as the R.V. margin suggests, "obtained you by asking", and this thought is present in the New English Bible : "Satan has been given leave to sift all of you like wheat ; but for you I have prayed that your faith may not fail". Jesus Christ thus authenticates the background of the scene in Job. Satan has to come to God for permission to sift the disciples, and God gives this permission ; there is the suggestion that He sets a limit to the extent of the temptation. Finally, in Revelation xii. 10, when Satan is cast down to the earth, it is said of him that he accuses God's people before God day and night. To return to the Old Testament, an example of his accusation is given in Zechariah iii, when Satan accuses the high priest before the court of heaven.

Here is the basic fact about Satan. He is not a god of evil standing over against the God of supreme good. In this way he differs from the supreme evil spirit of Zoroastrianism. He is not indeed, responsible for all the sin in the world, as though he were the source of evil in the same way as God is the source of good. Thus the biblical belief in Satan is not dualistic. Our present Catechism is truly biblical when it speaks of the world, the flesh, and the devil, as each needing to be renounced. These three are linked, but they are not the same. If the devil were destroyed tomorrow, the world and the flesh would still be sources of temptation and sin. James i. 14 and Romans vii. 14f. are only two passages which speak of the evil that dwells within, without any reference to Satan. Again, the world is continually drawing us into conformity with itself, for example, Romans xii. 2 (Greek, *aion*), James iv. 4 (Greek, *kosmos*), without Satan's aid. Yet Satan is spoken of as "the god of this world" (*aion*) in II Corinthians iv. 4, and as "the prince of this world" (*kosmos*) in John xii. 31, and I John v. 19 says that "the whole world lieth in the evil one".

The picture that this gives is of Satan as a rebel against God, just as we are. He is the chief organizer of all rebellion against God in the universe, but this does not make him the ultimate source of all evil. Like the Communists he is anti-God, and is prepared to use anything and everything to further the rebellion. In so far as actual sins swing us away from God, Satan approves of them. When he obtains permission to test us, it is to shatter our confidence in God. But there is no reason to think that Satan wants the whole world to be involved in gross sin. It was the punctilious Pharisees to whom Jesus Christ said, "Ye are of your father the devil" (Jn. viii. 44).

The essential character of Satan is to be anti-God and anti-Christ. In so far as this is the sin of sins, Satan is the supreme sinner. Our misunderstanding of him is largely due to the fact that we do not see this as the essence of sin. If we can see it, we can also see that Satan is by no means concerned to bring about a world that is full of sins. He desires a world that is self-sufficient and hence independent of God. This is what he induced man to accept at the Fall, and this is what he tried to induce Christ to accept in the wilderness temptations. Only if we see this can we accept the biblical view of the world. There are degrees of goodness and badness in the world, if we judge actions as

things in themselves. Thus “the powers that be are ordained of God” (Rom. xiii. 1), and on the whole maintain righteousness; yet they are part of the sphere that is governed by the god of this world. At their worst they may become persecutors of the people of God; at their best they still need that regeneration that will bring them out of Satan’s kingdom into the kingdom of God. The world is bad because it aims at self-sufficiency instead of God-sufficiency, but it is potentially recoverable.

We ought to follow this up further in the light of the proper Christian attitude to such things as the United Nations Organization. Some evangelicals hold that all such groupings are of the devil, since they have no Christian foundation, and that consequently the Christian Church must have no part in them. Some even feel called upon to denounce them. The New Testament, however, calls on us to pray for kings and leaders, that their leadership may bring about peace, tranquillity, and godliness (I Tim. ii. 1, 2). Yet this is but a preliminary to Gospel salvation and the knowledge of the truth (3, 4). In other words, mankind as a whole knows from experience, which has partly been developed under the influence of the teachings of Christ, that peace and the suppression of some evils are essential for the well-being of communities and individuals, and Satan has to accept this. He is dealing with men and women who still retain something of the image of God (1 Cor. xi. 7, Jas. iii. 9), even though that image has been marred in all its parts. Thus a Christian will often be one with the world and with Satan in trying to bring about desirable actions, while at the same time renouncing the inadequate motives that underlie the actions. Thus paradoxically a Welfare State can be Christian in the ends that it promotes, yet Satanic in the comfortable self-sufficiency that lulls it into spiritual sleep. The Christian is to use the world without abusing it (I Cor. vii. 31).

* * * *

The devil, then, is seen to be bad by reason of his rebellion against God, and not because of any eternal or finite quantity of bad deeds that he has committed. He is in a sense like ourselves, in whom evil, which came into the world through saying No to God, has become something positive and damaging. The fall of one who was created perfect is hard to understand, but the fall of Satan and the fall of man are the same in essence. Admittedly the fall of Satan is a deduction from Scripture, but no other deduction is possible if we are to avoid dualism. It is no longer fashionable to apply the words of Isaiah xiv. 12f. and Ezekiel xxviii. 11f. to Satan, yet this interpretation should not be totally abandoned. Thus in Ezekiel xxviii. 2-10 the prophet addresses “the *prince* of Tyre” in terms that are solely applicable to a human ruler, but at verse 11 he turns to address “the *king* of Tyre” in terms that are solely applicable to a spiritual being who is standing behind the movements in Tyre. Some interpreters speak of the language of myth here, yet the myth of a presumptuous and fallen spirit may well be the tradition about Satan. At the very least we must say that the inspired prophets compare the rulers of Babylon and Tyre to some high spirit who rebelled against God in his pride, and they must have believed that there was some basis for their comparison.

It is important to note that Jesus Christ clearly believed in the personality of the devil. It would be a poor sort of criticism which ascribed all the Gospel references to the primitive Church. The temptation in the wilderness can only have been told by Jesus Christ Himself. Admittedly the reality of Christ's temptations is a problem, but there is even more of a problem if Christ's temptations came from His own nature. While some of the intertestamental writings spoke of many Satans (or Adversaries), Jesus Christ and the New Testament writers speak of one Satan, or Devil, with other personal spirits under him. These include the demons, which are mistranslated in the A.V. as "devils"; there are two different words in the Greek for *devil* and for *demon*. There are others, who are spoken of as the devil's "angels" (Rev. xii. 9), and as "principalities and powers" (Eph. vi. 12). It is a reasonable assumption that Satan was not alone in his fall, and, since he is not ubiquitous, the acts of Satan include the acts of his agents.

It should now be clear that a belief in Satan does add something to a mere belief in evil. The warfare in which we are engaged is centred in the world where Jesus Christ died, but we are not the only combatants. Behind the scenes there is an unseen enemy of God, who is determined to manipulate the world against God so far as he is allowed to do so. He is particularly the adversary of those who break away from his hold. For them he uses especially the weapons of deceit and persecution. In the wilderness he did not attempt to lead Jesus Christ into gross sin, but to make a wrong choice of method. Similarly he attempts to lead Christians into wrong choices, often concerning Christ and the Gospel (for example, II Cor. xi. 13-15). At other times he is able to rouse persecution against them, like a roaring lion (for example, I Pet. v. 8). Both these aspects come out clearly in the two devil-inspired beasts in Revelation xiii.

So the devil is a master-strategist, enticing, deceiving, embittering, persecuting, but always God sets a limit to what he may do. To ask why God does not destroy him here and now is to ask why He does not destroy us at the same time. For purposes of His own God allows both the devil and ourselves to have freedom to continue in existence, even in sin.

How are we to think of the limits that God sets to Satan? We can hardly visualize Satan knocking at the door of heaven at any hour of the day or night, and asking "Please may I tempt so-and-so?", while God debates, "Shall I let him, or not?" It may be truer to think of certain broad spiritual principles, just as there are natural principles in the world of time and sense. For example, self-confidence (Luke xxii. 31), profound spiritual experiences (II Cor. xii. 7-10), unnatural physical behaviour (I Cor. vii. 5), an unforgiving spirit (II Cor. ii. 10, 11), automatically, as we may say, open doors for Satan to damage the individual and the Church. He has God's permission to intervene. But there are other occasions, as with Job, when God allows Satan to stir up trouble for those who have done nothing to deserve it. Satan seeks thereby to break the hold that God's people have on God; God purposes to bind them more closely to Himself. Hence comes the force of the battle.

For us in this era there is a new factor. The power of Satan was crippled on Calvary. John xii. 31 speaks of his being cast out. Revelation xii. 7f. also assumes the victory of Calvary. It is for us to stand firm and to claim the victory through the triumphant death of Jesus Christ, to maintain the Gospel testimony, and to be prepared to fling ourselves to the death into the battle (Rev. xii. 11). The result must always be the defeat of Satan, even if the blood of the martyrs has to become the seed of the Church. Sometimes the victory is seen with the eye of sense ; always it is there for the eye of faith.

* * * *

There has been no attempt in this article to give an encyclopedic treatment of all the biblical references to Satan, but rather to highlight the essentials. There must be very few people outside the sects who will actually deny that the Bible presents Satan as a personal being, personal in the sense of having an active will against God. It remains in conclusion to see whether we are forced by modern knowledge to reject this position. Admittedly this is a negative position, but there are some Christian beliefs, such as heaven, or the judgment, or the personality of the Holy Spirit, that are accepted as facts of revelation even though they cannot be demonstrated as true or untrue. The fact that they were taught by Jesus Christ is for the Christian a sufficient attestation of their truth.

We grant that when Jesus Christ spoke of the sun rising, He used commonsense language, which, though not scientifically true, expresses what all can understand without being misled. Yet it is difficult to put His statements about Satan into this category, since the facts cannot be proved or disproved by scientific instruments. Here the evidence of One who claimed to be totally sensitive to the spiritual world must be paramount. The demythologizing argument that the Jews and Gnostics believed in spirits, and consequently Jesus and the New Testament expressed experience in terms of spirits, is no argument one way or the other.

The sole ground on which one might dispute the existence of Satan and other spirits would be the findings of modern psychology. We must go into this with our eyes open. Some modern psychologists—though, thank God, not all—think that by explaining religious experience along certain lines they have disproved the existence of God and evil spirits. It is thoroughly inconsistent for a Christian to reply : "In explaining my experiences, you have shown that my belief in Satan is fallacious, but I refuse to accept your arguments about God". If we say, "I know God for myself, but I do not know Satan," the psychologist will reply that our knowledge of God, so-called, is purely our interpretation of certain feelings which have arisen in the course of our upbringing, as is other people's interpretation of certain feelings in terms of Satan.

A possible come-back would be that the belief in Satan is pragmatically and psychologically bad, since it is an escape from accepting personal responsibility for sin, and the projection of our sins on to an external scapegoat. If this were the biblical view of our relationship with Satan, there might be something to be said for it, but we have already seen

that the Bible never leads us to put the responsibility for our personal sins on Satan. Moreover we must again note that this argument is double-edged, since God also may be the projection of our good self, and the belief that God puts into our minds good desires may be completely fallacious.

In the last resort it is probable that people have in mind the excesses to which belief in the devil has led. If people had known more about complexes and hysteria, there would never have been the terrible witch hunts that have marred the history of the Church. Equally, one might add, there might not have been the religious excesses that have arisen in the worship of God. Our mistake lies in our insistence on an *Either-Or*. Either this experience is supernatural, or it is natural, either it is from God, or from an infancy conflict with my parents, either it is the devil, or it is a complex. Both God and the devil use human personality. Out of an infancy situation God can fashion a personality that will be just right for a sphere in the Church; or the devil may fasten on a repressed conflict and use the unregenerate person, or immature Christian, as a centre of conflict for God's work. Those who wish to follow this up will find an excellent chapter, entitled "Devils and Complexes", in Victor White's *God and the Unconscious*, now reprinted in a paperback.

To discuss the nature of demon possession, in which I firmly believe, would be beyond the scope of this article. Similarly to introduce a detailed study of witchcraft and of Satanism (which modern witches say has nothing to do with witchcraft) would be to wander far beyond the Catechism, to which we must now return.

The omission of the devil in a Christian catechism is to shut the young Christian's eyes to a vital aspect of revelation and life. The Bible does not present evil as an impersonal force that only emerges personally in individuals and groups in this world. To resist sin and evil is vital; but we are only half alive to the situation if we do not see that there is a personal organizer of the world's revolt, who will try to exploit us if he can. Jesus Christ met him, and struck him a mortal blow on the Cross. We too will meet him, and the victory of the Cross is to be our weapon. To renounce "the devil and all his works" is to seek to become aware of his total strategy against the Church, and to oppose him (and not only sinful individuals) in the warfare of intelligent prayer and action.

A Synoptic Irony?

BY RONALD WARD

IRONY may be defined as saying the opposite of what you really mean ; but you must not be taken literally. It is a mark of the Johannine style, as Professor C. K. Barrett has so clearly shown us. When Pilate said "Behold your King!" (Jn. xix. 14), the argument of the Jews that the release of Jesus would be hostility to Caesar "is thrust back upon them with bitter irony".¹ They will never improve on that!

Again, "Johannine irony scarcely reaches a higher point"² than the remark of Caiaphas that it was to their advantage that one man should die for the people (Jn. xi. 50). Irony in a wider sense of the term is not infrequent in the Fourth Gospel. The "living water" of Jn. iv. 10 is the Holy Spirit and is used "partly because its double meaning conformed to John's ironical style".³ The misunderstanding of our Lord's words in Jn. ii. 19 ("Destroy this temple . . .") is characteristic of John and is, as often, "more than a literary trick employed by a writer given to irony".⁴ Dr. Barrett gives a list of words of double or doubtful meaning⁵ on which John plays. There is often a superficial meaning and a deeper one to the same word or expression. It is irony in this less restricted sense with which we are now concerned.

Is there anything corresponding to this in the Synoptic Gospels? We turn naturally to the parables, especially if we think that they are "riddles" in some cases. But this is the wrong tack. They are hardly likely to be obscure sayings if they are "weapons of warfare"⁶ or "a mode of religious experience".⁷ I have in mind, rather, straightforward narrative, especially a record of our Lord's conversation. Can we sometimes elicit a deeper meaning?

* * * *

There is a well known *crux interpretum* in the story of what Huck calls "The Rich Young Man" (Mt. xix. 16-30; Mk. x. 17-31; Lk. xviii. 18-30). A man ran up to Jesus, kneeled down to Him, and asked Him : "Good Teacher, what am I to do to inherit eternal life?" Our Lord replies with a counter-question : "Why do you call Me good? No one is good except One, God". This apparent disclaimer is a knotty point for the exegete; how could the sinless Son of God speak thus? It is customary to point to Matthew's reverential alterations of the Markan text : "Teacher, what good thing am I to do to get eternal life?" The Lord replies : "Why do you ask Me about the good? There is One Who is good". This hardly is an advance. Who is the One? It can hardly be our Lord Himself, unless there is a deeper reason which may emerge later. It must then be God, which is the position adopted by Mark and Luke.

The question may be regarded as still open, as there is by no means unanimity among exegetes. Modern commentators may be roughly

classified according to their rejection of a claim to divinity, their reference to absolute goodness, and a less profound exposition.

As representative of the first class Grant boldly says : " . . . still later theologians interpreted it otherwise : ' if you call Me good, you imply that I am God '—but this is wholly impossible, both in the original setting . . . and for Mark '.⁸ Is it impossible for Mark ? " Mark's christology is a high christology, as high as any in the New Testament, not excluding that of John . . . his assumption appears to be that Jesus is *Deus absconditus*, the Hidden God."⁹ Is it impossible in the original situation ? Our Lord seems at times to have hinted at the truth rather than stated it explicitly. The Messianic Secret may well be no literary device but a mode of the Lord's ministry. Commenting on the theory of Lagrange, Dr. Taylor can leave ample room for later insight : " On this view Jesus uses *bar nasha* in (Mk. ii. 10 in a sense which was Messianic to Himself, but non-Messianic, yet a challenge to reflection, in the hearing of His opponents. It ought not to be assumed that it was His purpose to be immediately understood, especially if in His own estimation, and not merely in the mind of Mark, He was *Messias absconditus*. "¹⁰ We need not be Sabellians to suggest enterprise in the face of such a " challenge to reflection ".

In view of these considerations Blunt goes too far in remarking that " it is as unwarrantable to read this phrase (i.e. Mk. x. 18) as involving an acknowledgement by Jesus that He is not ' good ', that He is ' conscious of sin ', as it is to read in it a covert claim to be divine (so some orthodox commentators) ".¹¹ " Covert," though not perhaps the best, may be the operative word.

Again, Dr. Wood leaves himself open to criticism. He states that " v. 18 cannot be intended to lead on to a confession of divinity ; it is rather the expression of that humility which was part of the moral perfection of Jesus ".¹² It reminds me of the remark attributed to Spurgeon, to the effect that it would be wrong for him to deny, if asked, that he could preach. It is no part of humility to deny the truth. The question is left open, in spite of Easton's shaft that " older commentators avoided dogmatic obstacles by a facile but impossible exegesis ".¹³ The " impossibility " may be due to an imposed christology; and we must hope that our exegesis will not prove " facile ".

In the second class stands the respected figure of W. Manson. " Goodness ", he says, " in the full sense implies not only the absence of defect but a perfectly unlimited range of moral activity, and this in the nature of things can belong only to God ".¹⁴

G. B. Stevens held that our Lord's aim was " to heighten the man's idea of goodness. . . . Hence Jesus himself declines the epithet. He is himself passing through the process of human development ".¹⁵ This is followed by Dr. Taylor, who believes that " His question implies a tacit contrast between the absolute goodness of God and His own goodness as subject to growth and trial in the circumstances of the Incarnation ". He further observes that " the use of the question along with the statement that God alone is good implies a contrast of some kind between Jesus and God ".¹⁶ Without pressing the point, we may wonder if " absolute goodness " is a philosophical element alien to the context.

This may be countered by McNeile, who judges that the man's "conception of goodness was inadequate, since he treated it as quantitative, and attainable by a definite act or series of acts. Jesus therefore gave to the adjective its deepest meaning".¹⁷ Cranfield likewise notes that the man's idea of goodness involves no more than human achievement, and helpfully refers to Jn. v. 19: "The Son can do nothing of himself". In consequence, "Jesus directs the young man's attention away from himself to his Father, who is the only source and only norm of goodness".¹⁸ But in an analogous case our Lord says, "I will, be thou clean" (Mk. i. 41), without saying that it is the Father's will also (cf. Jn. v. 30). And in any case can the Father's absolute goodness be the norm of human goodness, without further qualification? This question, it seems to me, is one which ought to be put, to balance any interpretation of this class. Thus, according to Filson, ". . . (Jesus) implies that the Father is good in a sense that even Jesus may not claim. Jesus is not confessing sin, but saying where the clear standard of perfect holiness, undimmed by sin or human limitations, is found".¹⁹ A salutary corrective or at least a challenge to this is to be found in the words of T. H. Green: "It is because Jesus, under limiting conditions, lived a life which is limited to no conditions, and under special circumstances proclaimed a principle which is applicable to all circumstances, that His life and His principle are rightly called absolute".²⁰

Archbishop Carrington neatly evades the issue: "(The word God) creates a problem in theology for those who deduce theologies from these conversational exchanges: was he disclaiming the word 'good' for himself? An absurd question."²¹ Theologies are not thus deduced, though they may be reflected in such exchanges. We are here indebted to T. W. Manson who pointed out the vital principle that "the essential spirit and principles of the whole Ministry (actualize) themselves in the seemingly unimportant details of his teaching and his behaviour".²²

The third class need not detain us long. A. B. Bruce thought our Lord was rebuking the ascription of goodness as a matter of mere courtesy, and detected "the supremacy of the ethical". He surprisingly adds that "Jesus . . . thinks so well of this man as to desire him for a disciple".²³ Others see a check to self-confidence²⁴ and, from early times, to flattery.²⁵ According to Leaney, "Jesus is as unconscious of his sinlessness as he is free from a sense of sin".²⁶ But all these interpretations, both singly and as a whole, are unsatisfying. "The God who is good alone, and the Christ whom it is life to follow, are set side by side, and left unrelated. Can there be two absolutes?"²⁷

It is understandable, therefore, that from the Fathers onwards some reference to our Lord's divinity has been seen. Calvin held that it was "as if He had said, 'thou falsely callest Me a good master, unless thou acknowledgest that I have come from God'".²⁸ Dean Alford asserts that "our Lord's answer . . . is a pointed rebuke of the very view of Christ which they who deny His divinity entertain. He was no 'good Master' . . . He was *one with Him* who only is good, the Son of the Father . . . The low view then, which this applicant takes of Him and His office, He at once rebukes and annuls." Alford

proceeds to state again the dilemma : “ *either*, ‘ There is none good, but God : Christ is good : therefore Christ is GOD ’ ;—*or*, ‘ There is none good, but God : Christ is not God : therefore Christ is NOT GOOD ’ ”.

A decade after this Cook can write : “ Nothing but a recognition of the divinity of Christ could justify the expression used by Him, if it were taken in its highest and absolute sense ”. (Jesus will not permit the term as a conventional form of an expression of reverence.)

“ This text, however, is not a declaration of that doctrine, but a preparation for it.”²⁹ In more recent days a choice spirit can comment thus : “ It is as though He had said : ‘ You have given Me a title of adoration. Do you mean it ? ’ ”³⁰ And now (1956) Geldenhuys shows still the vitality of the view which refuses to dispense with some reference to our Lord’s divinity : “ . . . as the whole context shows, Jesus here teaches indeed that He is one with God and thus claims absolute authority over the life of man ”.³¹

It may be that a kenotic christology has influenced exegesis. It may be that some ascriptions of divinity are naive or facile. But it would seem that a fresh examination of the text would not be out of place.

* * * *

The rich man, then, came with his question and Jesus countered with His own question.

Mark and Luke record our Lord’s next words thus : “ You know the commandments ”. Matthew adds some details : “ If you wish to enter into life, keep the commandments ”. The man says to Him, “ Which ? ” At this point Matthew, in common with Mark and Luke, quotes from the Decalogue. With minor variations of order and style, all three record : “ Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, honour thy father and mother ”. Matthew prefixes the Greek singular definite article to his quotation from the Decalogue, which has the effect of turning the whole expression into a sort of large composite noun. It may be presumed that our Lord is making a selection, and the definite article serves to *identify* the source : “ (What commandments ?) the (list that every Jew knows, containing, for example) thou shalt not kill. . . . ” Matthew adds, “ and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself ”.

Notice what our Lord has done. He has not merely quoted some commandments, any commandments as long as the Decalogue is identified ; in all three accounts, whether that of Matthew, Mark, or Luke, He has chosen those which are concerned with social action. All are concerned with men. Murder, adultery, theft, false witness, and failure to give reverence to parents ; all are sins against a fellow human being. There is no mention of God at all.

Cranfield has observed that “ only commandments of the Second Table are mentioned . . . , not because they are regarded as more important than those of the First Table, but because it is by a man’s obedience to the former that his obedience to the latter must be outwardly demonstrated ”.³² He may well be right. But it is important to notice that it is the Second Table—no more.

Observe the sequel. “ Teacher ”, says the Markan account (not

" good teacher " !), " all these have I kept (Mt., Mk., and Lk.) from my youth (Mk. and Lk.) ; wherein am I still lacking ? (Mt.)." That is precisely the point. Something is missing. What is it ?

Taylor quite rightly rejects the idea that " just one act " is necessary for eternal life ; this is gained by following Jesus. But, comparing the LXX of Ps. xxiii. 1, he suggests that " the man lacks one all-important thing supplied only by a resolute sacrifice ".³³ The " thing " is no doubt, in the language of Ps. xxiii, to have God as his Shepherd. But this is " supplied " only negatively by the sacrifice. Cranfield is on surer ground when he explicitly states that " the one thing lacking is the all-important thing, a single-hearted devotion to God ". This he regards as " obedience to the first of the Ten Commandments ".³⁴ Is this the last word ?

So far the man has had no room in his life for God. It is almost an open invitation to refer, not to the First Commandment, but to the First Table. There are four commandments so far not mentioned :

Thou shalt have none other gods before Me.

Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image . . .

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain . . .

Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy . . .

It would seem that he is trying to gain eternal life without God : which is impossible. Now if we state these commandments positively, we may say : one thing is lacking : worship truly the true God

uniquely : none other gods before Me

spiritually : no graven image, that is, no idolatry

seriously : God's name not to be taken in vain

regularly : keep holy the sabbath.

We almost expect our Lord to speak in this manner. But He does not. Or rather, He does, but He gives to His expected words (for us) an exciting turn.

The man had great possessions. It is generally recognized that the command to sell all and give to the poor is not a general rule but a particular case. Why was the man told to get rid of his property ? Cranfield speaks of " possessions which have become an idol ", but goes on to say that " Jesus seems to be at this point particularly concerned with the First Commandment ", and adds : " it is perhaps also an indication that the First and Second Tables of the Law cannot be separated ". But though within an inch of his goal he does not draw the inference.

The man had great possessions and worshipped them. First, then, he must smash up his idols : sell all that you have ! But what is he to do with the pieces ? Instead of throwing them away or burning them he may as well benefit somebody : give to the poor. The ground has now been cleared. It would have been the easiest thing in the world for our Lord to have relied once again on the word He had used at the Temptation : thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him only shalt thou serve. It would have been equally easy, and in context, to have quoted the First Table, for it would have been the appropriate rebuke to idolatry. But He did not speak thus. He said instead : " Come ! Follow—ME ! "

Who is this Person who thus puts Himself in the place of God ? We may, if we are foolish with the foolishness of impiety, assert that it is but the man Jesus, a poor peasant with a magnificent ethic but a perverted theology. But if we pay attention to a sort of non-Johannine irony of ambiguity, and look to a deeper meaning in our Lord's words to a new commandment which is but a Christian exposition of the old Decalogue, we shall hear the divine voice in the human, and recognize in the Man of Nazareth the Deity who dwelt among men.

In the light of this we may return to the beginning of the story. "Why do you call Me good ? No one is good except One, God." It may well be the case that our Lord rebuked the man for calling Him good *without knowing who He was*. There is a story told of a Roman emperor who used to stroll at night through the streets of the city. To preserve anonymity he dressed as a slave, and as might have been expected he was at times involved in street-fights. One night he found himself fighting with a senator, who struck him vigorously. The unhappy senator later recognized the identity of the "slave" and sought pardon. But it was refused : what the emperor would have tolerated when unrecognized, he declined to allow when known. It is the opposite with Jesus. What He would have tolerated if the rich man had recognized Him He declined to allow when He was merely "found in fashion as a man".

It may be that Alford was right. It may be that we are not so naive after all if we see here the very Son of God who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven. It may be that our Lord's words have both a superficial and a deeper meaning. They send us back to search the Synoptics again to try and find out if there are yet further instances of what we have somewhat loosely called a non-Johannine irony.

Such an exegesis has certain points in its favour. It recognizes the sense of contrast which has impressed Dr. Taylor so much, only it is a contrast between the Lord recognized and unrecognized. It is not impossible for Mark, who, as we have seen, seems to believe in Jesus as the *Deus absconditus*. It would be rash to say that it would have been impossible for our Lord, unless we assume that His filial consciousness was limited to the "devotional". This is His secret. Are we forced to believe that He did not know who He was ? It further makes the "one thing" big enough. And it allows for the "absolute" and "relative" uses of the word "good". As unrecognized, our Lord has still to complete His ministry. He is good at every point, and will yet achieve wider good (Lk. ii. 52 ; Heb. v. 7-9) : He learnt obedience from what He suffered.

Is the suggestion of a Synoptic irony tenable ? I hope that others will investigate this field. In the meantime, as T. W. Manson once said in another connection³⁵, it is "a fascinating picture".

NOTES

¹ C. K. Barrett, *St. John*, p. 454.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 339.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 196.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 166.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 173.

- ⁶ J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, p. 19.
 - ⁷ T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, p. 73.
 - ⁸ F. C. Grant, *Interpreter's Bible*, VII, p. 801.
 - ⁹ Vincent Taylor, *St. Mark*, p. 121.
 - ¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 200; cf. O. Cullman, *The Christology of the New Testament*, p. 318.
 - ¹¹ A. W. F. Blunt, *St. Mark*, p. 217.
 - ¹² H. G. Wood, *Peake's Commentary* (1926) p. 693.
 - ¹³ B. S. Easton, *St. Luke*, p. 271.
 - ¹⁴ W. Manson, *St. Luke*, p. 205.
 - ¹⁵ G. B. Stevens, *Theology of the New Testament*, p. 75.
 - ¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 426-9; cf. Cullman, *op. cit.*, pp. 93f.
 - ¹⁷ A. H. McNeile, *St. Matthew*, p. 277.
 - ¹⁸ C. E. B. Cranfield, *St. Mark*, pp. 327-330.
 - ¹⁹ Floyd V. Filson, *St. Matthew*, p. 209.
 - ²⁰ T. H. Green, *Works*, III, p. xxxix, quoted by H. R. Mackintosh, *The Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 393.
 - ²¹ Philip Carrington, *According to Mark*, p. 214.
 - ²² T. W. Manson, *The Servant-Messiah*, p. 67.
 - ²³ A. B. Bruce, *Exp. Gk. Test.* I, pp. 248-250.
 - ²⁴ A. Plummer, *St. Mark*, pp. 238f.
 - ²⁵ V. Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 427.
 - ²⁶ A. R. C. Leaney, *St. Luke*, p. 237.
 - ²⁷ Austin Farrer, *A Study in St. Mark*, p. 124.
 - ²⁸ *Harmony*, II, trans. by William Pringle, p. 393.
 - ²⁹ F. C. Cook, *Holy Bible With Commentary*, N.T., I, p. 263.
 - ³⁰ David Smith, *Disciple's Commentary*, I, p. 322.
 - ³¹ N. Geldenhuys, *St. Luke*, p. 458.
 - ³² Cranfield, *op. cit.*, p. 328.
 - ³³ *Op. cit.*, p. 429.
 - ³⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 330.
 - ³⁵ *Journal of Theological Studies*, XLVI, pp. 181ff.
-

The Imitation of Christ in I Peter

BY STEPHEN SMALLEY

CHAUCER'S *Tale of Melibee* tells the sad story of a young man named Melibeus whose wife Prudence and daughter Sophie are attacked and beaten by three of his enemies while he is in the "feeldes" disporting himself. On his return, Melibeus is stricken with grief, and is all for vengeance; but he is restrained by his wife (true to her name), who luckily recalls a sentence or two of Ovid recommending patience in adversity. Friends with advice are not wanting, but in no time at all the *Tale* settles down into a monumentally dull dialogue between husband and wife, full of the most excellent counsel, at the end of which Prudence wins her point, and the heart of Melibeus (not surprisingly, since Prudence has more than had her say) begins to "incline to the will of his wife".¹ But in the course of her argument Prudence has occasion to quote, as well she might, the example of Christ's patient endurance mentioned in *I Peter*: "ye Owen to enclyne and bowe your herte to take the pacience of our lord Jesu Crist, as seith seint Peter in his epistles: 'Jesu Crist', he seith, 'hath suffred for us, and yeven ensample to every man to folwe and sewe him'."² It is this "taking" of the patience of Christ that provides a leading thread of thought in Peter's epistle; it seems to be informed by the writer's own experience, and has in mind throughout a practical and pastoral intent.

* * * *

We must begin with an exposition of the two chief passages in *I Peter* where the notion of *imitatio Christi* occurs, in order to discover the precise nature and significance of their setting.

(i) *ii. 21ff.* In chapter ii the writer embarks on his second doctrinal section (verses 4-10), dealing with the nature and function of the Christian Church. In the passage *ii. 11-iii. 12* he goes on to apply this doctrine in terms of the Christian ethic in its social, family, and individual aspects. F. L. Cross, following his thesis that *I Peter* comprises a baptismal liturgy for the paschal vigil, regards this section as part of the bishop's address to the newly-baptized on the duties of Christian discipleship, dealing in this case with moral responsibility.³ From a different standpoint, A. M. Hunter has indicated the extent to which the exhortations in *I Peter*, as in the Pauline *corpus* and some early Christian writings beyond the New Testament, are probably indebted to a common, primitive paraenetic tradition.⁴ Whatever the source, the teaching remains clear: in view of their Christian calling to be the true temple (*ii. 5*) and Israel of God (*verse 10*), Peter urges his readers negatively to allow no place for the impulses which arise from solidarity with the first Adam (*verse 11*), and positively to give full rein to the fruit of their incorporation into the second (*verse 12*).

After a plea against civil disobedience, on the grounds of the divine origin of all temporal authority (verses 13-17), Peter uses the master-servant relationship, to which he turns, as an illustration of the way in which the principles of daily Christian living are to reflect those involved in membership of the Christian community itself (verses 18ff.). The Christian slaves addressed are encouraged to pursue, within the existing social structure, a policy of submission, since they are in any case freedmen ἐν χριστῷ; and such innocent suffering as they are called upon to bear may now be offered to God, and for Christ's sake transformed. It is to this kind of patience, indeed, that they are "called" (verse 21), since the vicarious suffering of Christ (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν—some MSS. read ἡμῶν) was *par excellence* a demonstration of endurance both exemplary in its character (verses 22f.), and effective in its outcome (verse 24). The steps of their Ποιμήν and Ἐπίσκοπος, to whom they have converted, are for these slaves to become an abiding ὑπογραμμός (verse 21).

(ii) iii. 18ff. These verses occur in the third and final doctrinal section (iii. 13-iv. 19), in which the writer discusses the redemptive work of Christ in its most inclusive categories, as the ground once more for Christian patience in suffering. Mention of the sufferings of Christ, who died δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων (verse 18a), arises from a reminder of the painfulness as well as the glory of being dead to sin (verses 13-17), and leads to the exhortation, "arm yourselves with a temper of mind like his" (iv. 1, NEB); and this followed by a further application of the *imitatio* theme in the face of a suffering which seems by now to have overtaken the readers (verses 12ff.). Professor C. F. D. Moule has suggested that this section (iv. 12-v. 14) belongs to a letter written to Christians actually undergoing suffering, and that it was combined with an alternative epistle (i. 1-iv. 11, etc.) which was written in preparation for persecution, and is therefore less "terse" and "swift" in style.⁶

Verses 18b-22 of chapter iii form an excursus on the congruence of Christ's suffering and that of the Christian, expanded in terms of the *descensus ad inferos* (iii. 19, the single explicit New Testament reference to this doctrine), and given its focus, as we shall see later, in baptism. The sovereignty of Christ's person and the efficacy of His work, are clearly as inclusive in their application as His experience of every area of existence. The vindication of the Lord Christ, and His victory over sin and therefore death, similarly means that the Christian who dies to sin by incorporation into Christ (iii. 21) is able in union with Him to know, particularly through the discipline of suffering, the conquest of sin (iv. 1), and also to live θελήματι Θεοῦ (verse 2).⁶ It is because this is true, moreover, that the πρεσβύτεροι addressed are able in turn to become τύποι of the flock of God (v. 1-4).

* * * *

We are now in a position to examine more closely the theme of *imitatio Christi* in I Peter; and this we shall do by investigating the way in which the Christ-Christian relationship is rotated around the concept of suffering.

In the first place, it is important to notice, as E. G. Selwyn points out,⁷ the deep connection made by our writer between soteriology and ethics. His encouragement to holiness in i. 15f. (citing Lev. xi. 44), for example, picks up the antecedent references to the death of Christ in that chapter (verses 1 and 11), and introduces a summary of the redemptive work of Christ as both spiritual in effect and eternal in scope (verses 18-21). The weighty link-words, Διό (verse 13) and διότι (verse 16), and the participial constructions in verses 18ff. which are followed by doctrinal statement as well as ethical encouragement, pull the thought of this chapter very much together, and underline the truth that it is because of the work of the holy God in Christ on our behalf that we are able to achieve the very holiness He demands: κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἄγιον καὶ αὐτὸι ἄγιοι (i. 15). F. W. Beare insists that ultimately the life of holiness for this epistle is grounded not in the imitation of Christ, but in the nature of God Himself.⁸ But are we not able, none the less, to see the *imitatio Christi* in Petrine terms as one means to that end? To follow the example of Jesus will result in a holiness reflecting the very character of God, and expressed practically by means of active well-doing (*cf.* ii. 15, 20; iii. 17; iv. 19).

The connection between the death of Christ and the life and conduct of the Christian becomes clearer from the more explicit treatment of the *Christus patiens* theme in chapter ii. It is the incarnate life and example of Christ that are in mind in this passage, considered exclusively in the context of His demeanour in suffering, and against the background of Isaiah liii. The catch-word of verses 18-25 is "subordination", and the logion of injunction to slaves (in this case) reads, ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν πάντι φόβῳ (that is, of God) τοῖς δεσπόταις.⁹ Three features of the sufferings of Jesus are selected for particular mention: it was innocent (verse 22), submissive (verse 23, *cf.* ii. 13), vicarious (verse 24); it was also, incidentally, as Messiah, inevitable (i. 11; *cf.* Lk. xxiv. 25f.). In line with His own promise (Mark viii. 34f., *al.*), the followers of Jesus must also be prepared for suffering, according to the ὑπογραμμός—literally, either the design for a sketch or a pattern to be copied—of the Master Himself. A. M. Stibbs points out the force of the compound ἐπακολουθήσητε: the example of Jesus is to be followed *closely*, in the spirit of the command given to Peter himself and the other disciples on the occasion of the *Pedilavium* (John xiii. 15, 17).¹⁰

Now it is evident that there is a close connection between the attitude of the Lord adopted during His passion, and the incident of Calvary itself. Reference to the παθήματα of Christ in ii. 21, for example (where ἔπαθεν is certainly the correct reading), leads naturally to the mention of His death in verse 24; and these two thoughts are yoked even more closely together in iii. 18. Corresponding to this connection is the parallel behaviour of the Christian which the writer is encouraging. The persecution of believers may well lead to their martyrdom; and if *en route* their sharing in the sufferings of Christ (χοινωνεῖτε, iv. 13, an integral part of the *imitatio* doctrine, and a clue to its quiddity) leads also to the conversion of others, as the cross

of Christ leads to the life of all men (ii. 24f.), this is a matter for nothing but rejoicing (ii. 12 ; iv. 13b).

We come again to the passage, iii. 18ff. In these verses the soteriological stress shifts from that of *Christus patiens* to that of *Christus victor*.¹¹ In the earlier chapter, iii. 21ff., the submission of Christ was in mind ; here, the triumphant and final use of ἀπαξ (verse 18) provides in itself the setting for a new key. This fresh theme is developed through the implications of the participial ζωοποιηθείς, used in apposition to χριστός, in terms of the *descensus ad inferos*. The notion of "descent" bears out for Peter not only the fact of Christ's experience of every possible realm of existence, but also the truth of an inclusive announcement (ἐκήρυξεν, verse 19) of His vindication and sovereignty (verse 22). But the important lesson being taught, for our purposes, is that the vicarious (ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, verse 18 ; cf. ii. 21), atoning (περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν ; cf. ii. 24) death of Christ is to be regarded as the ground of all Christian behaviour : καὶ ὑμεῖς τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν ὅπλισασθε (iv. 1).

In the course of his extended and illuminating treatment of the issue of the "disobedient spirits" in *I Peter*, Bo Reicke has a section on iii. 17, 18 in which he considers the precise implications of those two verses.¹² Reicke finds a close connection between them, linked as they are by καὶ (verse 18a) ; and he suggests that the expressions in verse 18 indicate accordingly "what is common to the Saviour and the saved".¹³ If Christ's death περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν be taken to mean, "He died (sc. for others) as a sin-offering", then the parallelism becomes clear : Christians must be prepared to risk suffering and even death in order to win the unconverted for Christ (verse 17, recapitulating the paraenesis of verses 13-16), just as Christ died for us, as a sin-offering, to bring us who are equally unrighteous to God.¹⁴ This then becomes the second argument advanced in support of the paraenesis in iii. 13-16 ; the third, verses 19ff., is the fact of the *descensus* itself, with its implications already discussed. Certainly this analysis makes admirable sense of the whole section iii. 13-22 ; but it also lends weight to the appositions θανατωθείς and ζωοποιηθείς (used of Jesus in verse 18), when these are considered in the light of the Petrine doctrine of the imitation of Christ. Not only, however, is the context that of a "martyr ideology", in Reicke's phrase ;¹⁵ its gravitation-point is surely also that of baptism itself, the focus of the believer's death and resurrection.¹⁶ It is to the meaning of the recapitulatory phrase, "Baptism, which corresponds to this, now saves you" (verse 21, RSV, a reference thought by some to interrupt an otherwise unified credal passage), that we must now turn.

* * * *

To what does the ἀντίτυπος of baptism correspond ? The "figure" under review in verse 20 is the deliverance of Noah and his company from the judgment of God. The Greek, however, is difficult : either they were "brought through" the water (διεσώθησαν δι' ὑδατος), or alternatively, taking διά as "by", the flood-waters,

which brought judgment to the disobedient, brought salvation to them. E. G. Selwyn takes ἀντίτυπον to refer to ὑμᾶς and not to βάπτισμα;¹⁷ but surely the most natural sense is that baptism "corresponds" to the antecedent means of salvation cited from the Old Testament. But even as an "antitype" it is much more than simply a "figure", since in baptism the *imitatio Christi* takes its origin and finds its enabling. Here the believer accepts the judgment of God upon sin already accepted by Christ in the βάπτισμα of the cross, and rises from spiritual death, through the resurrection of the Saviour, to newness of life in Him.¹⁸ It is incorporation that effects this, not simply participation (verse 21b); and here no doubt Peter still has in mind the participles θανατώθεις and ζωοποιηθεῖς of verse 18, since it is precisely in baptism that the essential imitation of Christ becomes sacramentally possible. The very category of "imitation", in fact, is dynamic and (if we may use the term) existential. It belongs to the dimension of the new birth (i. 3), and is never, as a result, far removed in theology or experience from the grace and power of God: "the God of all grace, who called you into his eternal glory in Christ, will himself, after your brief suffering, restore, establish, and strengthen you on a firm foundation" (v. 10, NEB). Neither the Pauline "reckoning" of the self as "dead to sin" (Rom. vi. 11), nor the Petrine "imitation" of the Lord Jesus Christ, are to be thought of as matters of speculative imagination.

In the corporate setting of the spiritual household (ii. 5), the new life of faith (i. 8) and worship (ii. 5) and witness (ii. 9), in answer to the love of Christ (like the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Christian life, mostly implicit in this epistle) centred in His sacrificial self-offering, becomes full of an "exalted joy" (i. 8, RSV). It is in a dimension of glory and hope, indeed, as F. W. Beare points out,¹⁹ that the sufferings of Christ and of the Christian alike are set. Suffering for the name of Christ now (iv. 14) means participation in His own sufferings (iv. 13), and both, Christ's sufferings and ours in Him, anticipate the revelation of His glory (iv. 13) and our salvation (i. 5-7). We are back to the point from which we began: the Christ-Christian relationship considered in its paschal setting.

Suffering, said Dietrich Bonhoeffer, is "the badge of the true Christian". To follow Christ "means *passio passiva*, suffering because we have to suffer."²⁰ He does not leave it there, however, but goes on to speak of the transformation of Christian suffering into joy. Again, victory and vindication through the cross, disarming opposition by a reply of patient goodness to undeserved injury, are notes struck by another saint—this time a fifteenth century monk—in a famous version of the *imitatio Christi* theme: "Up, then, my brothers! Let us go forward together! Jesus will be with us. For Jesus' sake, we have taken up the cross; for Jesus' sake, let us persevere in it. He will be our helper, who is also our leader; He has gone before us".²¹ And these twin notions, suffering with joy and returning good for evil, after the pattern and in the strength of our Saviour Christ, are the heart of the doctrine of "imitation" in *I Peter*. Initiated in baptism, the believer's *imitatio Christi* may well find its focus in sufferings

answering Christ's, which, like the sacraments themselves, breathe eternity as well as history. As a result, the whole of *I Peter* becomes, in Ragnar Leivestad's words, "a testimony of striving faith, conquering love, and triumphant hope".²²

A Note on the word "vicarious"

The language of *I Peter* with reference to the death of Christ, particularly in ii. 21 ($\delta\pi\epsilon\rho\ \dot{\eta}\mu\omega\nu$) and iii. 18 ($\pi\varepsilon\rho\ \dot{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\nu\ldots\ \delta\pi\epsilon\rho\ \dot{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\omega\nu$) has prompted the use of the adjective "vicarious" to describe one significant aspect of the Atonement. A glance at standard works on the death of Christ, however, will reveal the variation and indeed confusion which have gathered round the use of this term, and the corresponding importance of precision in its present use.

Dr. J. S. Whale, for example, in his recent study of the Christian doctrine of redemption, *Victor and Victim* (1960), is anxious (*inter alia*) to eliminate wrong notions of penal substitution from our understanding of the Cross. In the course of his arguments he aligns "explicitly vicarious" *tout court* with "substitutionary" (p. 72; so also H. A. Hodges, *The Pattern of Atonement* (1955), p. 46); and this is coloured by his earlier ascription to Levitical sacrifice of the meaning, "penal substitution or (that is, alternatively) vicarious punishment" (p. 52, my italics). Clearly the issue is complicated further by Dr. Whale's attempt to determine the significance of "punishment" in this setting; but enough has been said to indicate that he appears to be allowing to the term "vicarious" only one soteriological implicate, and that substitutionary.

In his eagerness to focus one element of a doctrine, then, Dr. Whale has ignored its relation to the general category, since on etymological as well as theological grounds "vicarious" surely carries a wide connotation, denoted by the New Testament language of $\delta\pi\epsilon\rho$ ("on behalf of"), as well as $\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota$ ("in place of"). Jesus died vicariously as a "representative sacrificial offering to the Father on behalf of sinful humanity" (J. S. Whale, *op.cit.*, p. 58); and the language and thought of the New Testament seem to suggest that He also "stood condemned" vicariously in its place (*ibid.*, p. 70).

E. G. Selwyn, in his comment on iv. 1 (*op.cit., ad loc.*, p. 208), also mentions the "vicarious" suffering of Christ, which he believes this verse implies by picking up ($\circ\ddot{\nu}\nu$) the thought of iii. 18a. Indeed, his suggestion is that the vicarious element in Christ's sufferings was responsible for the early omission of the words $\delta\pi\epsilon\rho\ \dot{\eta}\mu\omega\nu$ (read by AKLP, *al.*) after $\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota$ at iv. 1, since it was felt to be one "beyond the scope of believers' imitation". But, as he also goes on to say, the "vicarious" element is in any case implied by the link between iv. 1 and iii. 18a; and the more important consideration is the sense in which the term "vicarious" will apply to the parallel behaviour of the *Christian* who suffers, if the deep connection between the sufferings of Christ and of the Christian, proposed above, is accepted.

It becomes clear at once that we must distinguish between the vicarious *atoning* sufferings of Christ (however widely the term "vicarious" is construed), and the "vicarious" suffering of Christians,

for the bearing of which the *παθήματα* of Christ provide both an example and a motive. Undertaken submissively (a Petrine keyword in chapters ii and iii, as we have seen), the innocent suffering of the believer "for righteousness' sake" (iv. 14) may well have reference to others (*cf.* II Cor. i. 6, where ὑπέρ again predominates, though Paul's teaching is more developed), causing them to be silenced (I Peter iii. 16), and even to "glorify God" (ii. 12).

¹ G. Chaucer, *Complete Works*, ed. W. W. Skeat (1912), p. 529, 1.3060.

² *Ibid.*, p. 521, 11. 2690-91.

³ F. L. Cross, *I Peter: a Paschal Liturgy* (1954), p. 39 *et passim*.

⁴ A. M. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors* (revised edn. 1961), p. 53; cf. E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (1946), *ad loc.*, pp. 168f., and P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism* (1940), pp. 23-29.

⁵ C. F. D. Moule, *The Nature and Purpose of I Peter*, in *NTS III*, 1956, pp. 1ff.

⁶ Cf. A. M. Stibbs, *The First Epistle General of Peter* (1959), p. 148: "What is here inculcated is more than *imitatio Christi* . . . It is rather *unio mystica*."

⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 20f.

⁸ F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter* (second edn. 1958), p. 35.

⁹ In the catechetical plan of Archbishop Carrington, this section belongs to the "Code of Subordination" (actually a Clementine phrase) which he finds emerging as one of the four "points" of teaching given to catechumens, and lying behind material common to *Colossians*, *Ephesians*, *I Peter*, and *James*. Its keyword is *subjecti estote*. See P. Carrington, *op. cit.*, pp. 31ff.

¹⁰ A. M. Stibbs, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*, p. 117.

¹¹ See the analysis of E. G. Selwyn, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*, p. 195.

¹² Bo Reicke, "The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism," in *Acta Seminariorum Neotestamentici Upsaliensis XIII*, 1946, pp. 211 ff.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 215.

¹⁴ Significantly enough, almost all the exhortations to "well doing" in this epistle (ii. 20; iv. 19, *al.*), are linked with the fact or possibility of suffering.

¹⁵ *Loc. cit.*, p. 218.

¹⁶ Hans Windisch (*Die Katholischen Briefe*, third edn. edited by H. Preisker, 1951, p. 70) considers iii : 18-22 to be actually a primitive baptismal hymn to Christ.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, *ad loc.*, p. 203.

¹⁸ Cf. Rom. vi. 4f.; and see C. F. D. Moule, "The Judgment Theme in the Sacraments," in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube (1956), pp. 464-481.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

²⁰ D. Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (tr. R. H. Fuller, 1948), pp. 74f.

²¹ Thomas à Kempis, *The Imitation of Christ* (tr. L. Sherley-Price, 1952), p. 172 (iii. 56; *cf.* iii. 19).

²² R. Leivestad, *Christ the Conqueror* (1954), p. 169.

Book Reviews

CHURCH ORDER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By Eduard Schweizer. (S.C.M.) 239 pp. 16s.

Dr. Schweizer, who is Professor of New Testament at Zürich and the author of *Lordship and Discipleship* in this series, has produced a most important and original study in this much canvassed sphere of church order. It is a book which must rank among the significant examinations of the subject not only for New Testament studies, but in the current ecumenical debate.

The author's method, after a very unusual and discriminating discussion of the authority of Scripture for the ordering of the Church, is, to begin with, analytical. He considers Jesus's conception of the Church, which he finds obscure enough, but at least it was an open fellowship, repudiating hierarchy, and following Jesus in self-renunciation for the world ; then that of the Primitive Community (including such disparate representatives as the early Jerusalem Church, that of Matthew and of the Pastorals), then the Pauline, Johannine, and sub-apostolic conceptions of the Church. In the second part of the book he synthesizes his findings, and faces up to such problems as Apostolic Succession, Charismatic and non-Charismatic Ministry, Church Service, and Office.

The first thing that impresses an English reader is the strong literary and historical scepticism displayed in a responsible Continental New Testament study like this : not only, of course, are the Pastorals, Colossians, and Ephesians not Pauline, and I Peter and the Johannines second century works, but we meet such assertions as that Jesus never spoke about the Church, baptism, or the Holy Spirit, that it is open to question whether the twelve were ever leaders in the Church, or whether Jesus ever called Himself the Son of Man. The disciples were certainly not apostles, and the words of institution do not go back to Jesus.

However, this minimizing of the evidence appears to strengthen, rather than weaken, his arguments from the sources about the nature of Church order. It is impossible in the space available to do justice to his position. But much of the book is devoted to showing that in the New Testament there is a duality about the Church. It is, on the one hand, identical with, or a part of, Israel (this point is laboured constantly) ; and this stand of historical continuity certainly runs through the New Testament. On the other hand, the Church is something new, a colony of heaven, an eschatological phenomenon in the space-time continuum. The first conception tends to look forward to the Parousia, and backward to the Cross, and stress credal formulæ and a regular ministry ; the second tends to look up to the ascended Lord who is at work among His people in a charismatic ministry of His sovereign choice. Both views, if taken in isolation, run practical and theological dangers ; in the one case, of formalism and Ebionism, in the other of

chaos and Docetism. But in the New Testament in general, and Paul in particular, they are held in fruitful tension. The Church, Dr. Schweizer insists, lives entirely on the grace of God ; its basis of faith, which of course is reflected in its mode of worship, is both the freedom and the faithfulness of God. Thus it makes no distinction between office and ministry, it recognizes the God-given ministerial function of the whole body (and that means that the sick woman's private intercession is just as important as the minister's public preaching), it cannot claim any guaranteed means of salvation, whether in hierarchical succession (bishops are at best of the *bene esse* of the Church) or confessional formulæ—or decisions for Christ. The Church lives on grace, and “only in Christ is it essentially the Church” (28a). The Church is still part of the world, to which it is committed in mission : only it is that part of the world which has heard and received God's gracious gift. He concludes with some practical suggestions arising out of his most stimulating exegesis.

This is a book to read and re-read. It has a depth, a spiritual perception, and an absence of *partis pris* that is most refreshing, as well as challenging. How seriously, for instance, do we take the New Testament assumption that while Church order is a manifestation of the Spirit (24), yet “God's grace is bestowed on every member, just as it is understood that every Church member can baptize, or distribute the Lord's Supper, and has the right to speak in any assembly of the Church” (22g)?

It only remains to mention a peculiarity of the arrangement of the book. In order to achieve uniformity with the German edition, references are made by sections not pages, and footnotes run on serially from 1 to 900.

E. M. B. GREEN.

THE MIND OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

By Owen Chadwick. (A. & C. Black.) 238 pp. 21s.

The name Oxford Movement fills many Evangelicals with fears of Romanism, priests mumbling mass, vestments, incense, and the rest of the ritual paraphernalia. Yet paradoxically the same people will treasure Liddon's Bampton lectures, value Pusey on Daniel, and sing with appreciation Newman's ironical hymn *Lead Kindly Light*.

Tractarian influence has been truly worldwide, and indirectly responsible for much of the drift of the Anglican Communion in a Romeward direction. This influence is also seen in the various Prayer Book revisions, which usually tend away from a Reformation anchorage. The Master of Selwyn College has confined his anthology to the period of the Tracts themselves. Writing with disarming charm, he sketches out the historical background of the Movement and the character of each of its leaders. The selections themselves fall under three heads with the third the largest—Faith, The Authority of the Church, and Sanctification. Professor Chadwick brings out the warmth of Tractarian devotion against the frigid background of seventeenth century rationalism. The Evangelical can admire much here—the hymns, Keble's interest in Bible study (p. 105), Pusey's passion for prayer (pp. 178ff.), and Isaac Williams's stress on obedience (p. 147). But there is more

to respect. Newman asserted, "If the Church would be vigorous and influential, it must be decided and plainspoken in its doctrine" (p. 144), and he went on to castigate misguided comprehensiveness. Pusey on Daniel was a bulwark against the impending threat of German radicalism, and his successor Canon H. P. Liddon refused to accept the debased liberal Christology.

Yet there is another side also. Professor Chadwick admits his omission in the anthology of any Tractarian polemics, but inevitably this distorts our vision of the mind of the Oxford Movement. (Indeed it is in doctrinal and dogmatic judgments that the Introduction is weakest.) For example, page 53 of the Introduction cites Froude : "Really I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more". The language may be extreme, but the sentiment is that of the Tractarians. Again, they looked to the Fathers as the true interpreters of the Bible. The Reformers had valued these ancients highly, but not uncritically. Cranmer, Jewel, and the others tested them against the Scriptures. The Oxford men idolized "the ancient Church", and set it over against the Reformation. By this phrase they meant the Fathers' views of the Bible and the Church together with occasional snatches from the Middle Ages. They failed to realize that the Reformers had rediscovered with great care the real mind of the ancient Church by going back to the Bible, and to the Fathers in as far as they did not run counter to the Bible. In effect, the Tractarians had all but gone back to the position of the Roman opponents of the Reformers. Again, can a "moderate and mediating" doctrine of justification such as Newman and Pusey expounded (pp. 49 and 109ff.) be that of Paul and the Reformers ? The true Reformation emphasis of justification by faith *alone* cannot be moderated or it becomes another doctrine. Again, ritualism : this must not be blamed on the Tractarians directly, though they opened the door to it. As late as 1879 Pusey writes : "People's minds are taken away from these glorious truths of the creeds, to be taught about these lesser things, or worse still, about birettas, and the people are alienated from us by things about which there is a good deal of pedantry". To the early leaders ritual was usually a secondary matter, even if Pusey's later dissuasive was partly in the interests of expediency.

The Oxford Movement and Professor Chadwick's anthology both resemble the proverbial curate's egg. The introduction and selection are excellent as far as they go, but they lack balance and may mislead the unwary reader. The Tractarian protest against rationalism was timely, and their personal spiritual discipline evokes our admiration. But despite their assertions to the contrary their worship was of a semi-Roman sort, and a reading of the Parker Society debunks the common fallacy that no Anglican had a doctrine of the Church and a sense of worship until the Oxford Movement.

The greatest tragedy of all was the degeneration of this Movement into the *Lux Mundi* group, for there, Tractarianism (already showing signs of decay) came to terms with a rampant and arrogant modernism. The end product can scarcely be called the best of either world.

UNITY, UNIFORMITY, AND THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

By S. C. Clark. (Mowbray.) 124 pp. 7s. 6d.

In this work the Vicar of Crockenhill, Kent, sets out to examine and reconcile the various traditions within the Church of England. To achieve this laudable aim, his method is to assess the Evangelical Revival and the Tractarian Movement, and then to point to lines of agreement without compromise. He believes there is no room for parties, but there is a place for differing emphases, both "Catholic" and Evangelical.

Unfortunately Mr. Clark seems to think that Evangelicalism is to be equated with a rather vague and undoctrinal pietism, and Calvinism is a veritable bogey to him. This failure to understand Evangelical theology leads to an unbelievably naïve treatment of key subjects like conversion, the sacraments, church and ministry, justification and sanctification. Too often the writer depends on unreliable secondary sources, and so an important topic is handled in an unreliable way. For example, he would not quote Dr. Mascall on the Reformation so authoritatively (p. 111), if he had read the strictures of a real Reformation scholar like Professor Rupp in *Protestant Catholicity*. The confusion over Baptism reflects the confusion of the Liturgical Commission and the Church of England generally today, but why blame this on the Prayer Book (p. 43)? Cranmer was not this muddled, as Dr. G. W. Bromiley has shown. Until recently Anglican exegetes had not been so superficial as to view adult baptism as the New Testament norm (p. 40). One wonders why they do not read the works of Pierre Marcel and Professor Jeremias; or, if they hold to their views, why do they not become Baptists? Mr. Clark's failure to appreciate Reformation eucharistic theology is complete, and we have had to wait for a Jesuit to inform ignorant Anglicans what the Prayer Book really meant by the Lord's Supper (Francis Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*).

We shall not go on, but if Mr. Clark wants to resolve tensions within Anglicanism, would he not be wiser to start with the historical and constitutional position of the Prayer Book and Thirty-Nine Articles, and then assess the deviations? To dismiss the sixteenth century, "since this was a period of great turmoil and confusion, when the Church was subject to a complicated succession of influences" (p. 2) only further underlines the author's naïvety. G. E. DUFFIELD.

THE SELECT WORKS OF JONATHAN EDWARDS.

Vol. II. Sermons. 276 pp. 10s. 6d.

Vol. III. The Religious Affections. 382 pp. 15s. (Banners of Truth.)

The first volume of this new series contained some sermons and *A Faithful Narrative* of the 1735/36 revival which took place in Edwards' parish in Northampton, New England. This second volume of sermons gives a fair example of Edwards' preaching. It contains particularly the sermon that first brought him into the limelight in Boston, Mass., when, at the age of twenty-seven, he was asked to preach, a Yale alumnus, at the Harvard Commencement, and he took as his subject

" God glorified in the work of redemption, by the greatness of man's dependence upon Him in the whole of it ". The last five words (usually—and here—omitted) stress the emphasis in which Edwards took conventional religion to task from the outset of his ministry. There is also here the " Enfield Sermon "—" Sinners in the hand of an Angry God "—which helped to promote the 1742 Awakening, and two of the five sermons, published to show the doctrine behind the 1735/36 revival. The rest are undated and come from his earlier ministry or posthumously edited sermons. Edwards was a preacher of wide pastoral and evangelistic range, and like many in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries he was pre-eminently a pulpit theologian. Thus the *Treatise Concerning Religious Affections* (there is no article in the original) was first given as sermons and later put completely into written treatise form for publication. It represents the mature thought of one whose ministry involved a great deal of personal counselling, not only in revival circumstances. It completes a number of lesser works on the subject and shows Edwards' insight, based on careful observation, integrated with his total theology. This is a spiritual classic and needs to be more widely known.

The welcome to this republication is mixed with some regret that a more scholarly approach was not attempted, if in nothing more, at least in the ordering of the material. In this it compares poorly with present Edwards studies in the United States. It gives the impression of being an enthusiastic but hardly skilful or informed selection. It is probably now too late to have the writings published in the kind of sequence or association useful for potential students ; but one might hope that further publication of older evangelical works might bear this in mind. The format is pleasing and makes for easy reading.

G. J. C. MARCHANT.

MY SPIRITUAL PILGRIMAGE : FROM PHILOSOPHY TO FAITH.

By E. Keri Evans. Translated from the Welsh by T. Glyn Thomas. (James Clarke.) 127 pp. 10s. 6d.

From the title one might infer that this book contains only the ramblings of a self-important introvert. From the subtitle one might suppose that the author had moved from a largely irreligious position to a largely religious one. Both assumptions would be wide of the mark. Keri Evans was a man who, despite the fact that he had captured all the prizes and scholarships in Philosophy at Glasgow under Edward Caird and had been Professor of Philosophy in Bangor University, retained a very lowly estimate of himself and was only prevailed upon to write this autobiography because, as he says in his preface, " some whose judgment I respect have persuaded me it is my duty ". Brought up in a Christian home and responding early to the call to be a minister of the Gospel, Evans was drawn aside by his love of poetry to engage in a search for the Beautiful, in such a way that philosophy, which he had intended should be a handmaid to his spiritual life, gradually became its master. From this thraldom the preaching of Henry Drummond in Glasgow ultimately helped to deliver him, and he came to see that intellectual knowledge of God and experimental

knowledge are two different things. Contact with Reader Harris, A. T. Pierson, R. B. Jones, and other leaders of the 1905 Welsh Revival led him into an ever deepening experience, so that, as he himself explains, the search for the Beautiful yielded to the search for the True and then to the search for the Holy. His faith was tested in many ways, notably by physical weakness and suffering, but his love for Christ grew in intensity and his reminiscences enshrined in this captivating book should be a help and inspiration to all who read it. Both the original Welsh edition over twenty years ago and this English translation of today owe their origin to the advocacy of Dr. Martin Lloyd-Jones of Westminster Chapel, London.

L. E. H. STEPHENS-HODGE.

THE PIONEER MINISTRY.

By Anthony Tyrrell Hanson. (S.C.M.) 176 pp. 21s.

The publishers are to be complimented upon a beautifully produced volume at a moderate cost. It is the finest work on the subject of the Christian Ministry since the publication of Bishop Lesslie Newbigin's *Household of God* (which strangely enough is not mentioned by Canon Hanson). The title may intrigue readers somewhat, yet no better one could be found to describe the character of the Apostles and their successors. In a time when the ecumenical movement is bearing fruit it is vital to examine the relationship of the Ministry to the Church. The book is offered to the public as an attempted contribution toward a doctrine. At every point the Ministry must be related to the Church and not divorced from it. The ministry is originally the Church *in nucleo*, the Faithful Remnant idea carried over from the Old into the New Testament, and repeated down the centuries in every mission field. Apostolicity is the Church engaged in its mission to reach the world with the Gospel. "The ministry is only apostolic in as far as it carried out this task of leading the Church into the Church's apostolic task." "Its task is essentially pioneer, it is the spearhead of the Church." Catholicity is "the quality of including all Christians". Baptism and not the Ministry constitute the Church. This is particularly so in the mission field where *comity* is practised. Doctrinal safeguards are necessary since heresy can un-church.

With real skill the author demolishes the viewpoint propagated by *The Apostolic Ministry*, although himself reared in the Tractarian camp. Chapter five breaks new ground for most people on the doctrine of the Ministry as he outlines St. Paul's exposition in II Corinthians. Chapter ten entitled "The Modern Debate" is the best part of the book. Almost everything of worth that has been written on the subject comes under review. Certain conclusions might be sampled. "The Church as a whole is the true heir to the mission of the Apostles." The Ministry is the Church in its pioneer, apostolic aspect, and hence the Ministry cannot be lost by mere failure of succession. The weakness of the "Catholic" view is the divorce of the Ministry from the Church.

The tendency of the Ministry has been to monopolize the apostolate of the Church. One choice piece of Irish humour is given us : If orders are indelible it seems illogical to conclude that because a bishop is

suffering eternal punishment he should be considered as having lost his orders! Like Daniel Jenkins, he stresses the concept of service as the very heart of the New Testament doctrine. This book will remain a standard work for another decade. It deserves to be read more than once.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

THREE HOURS.

By John M. Elphinstone-Fyffe. (Oxford University Press.) 106 pp. 12s. 6d.

How should we use to best advantage the hours of Good Friday? When the world is treating it as a festival for sport and license can we ignore the solemn possibilities it provides for true devotion? Do the statutory, or united, services really meet our need? Or is there a place for a three hours service? The author of this "new form" employs his experience with the B.B.C. Religious Department to offer us something worth considering. Such an act of devotion is as old as the fourth century. Its purpose is to watch, as it were, in spirit by the Cross during the dying hours of the Lord Jesus, and to meditate upon His words. Dissatisfaction with the accepted pattern has led the author to this new form. Two parts make up the book. First the difficulties to be encountered are mentioned, and then solutions are proposed. The conductor, the service, and the congregation are surveyed. The proposed set of readings and readers is outlined, with addresses and prayers, and some practical preliminaries. Secondly, the Service is set forth in nine sequences. The theme is victory through the Cross. Forgiveness and Temptation, Suffering and Faith, Humility and Obedience, Death and Conquest, are reverently treated in turn. Finally detailed notes are provided for the choice of hymns, etc. With genuine realism the author handles his material since so little is at hand for the would-be script producer in a non-liturgical field. Anglicans, he feels, are too little equipped to do it adequately. When the preacher is a "personality" he is in danger of dominating the set-up. As the late B. K. Cunningham used to say, "personality without truth is vulgarity. Truth without personality results in a university sermon". This particular type of service originated in 1946 in Ramsbury, Wiltshire. The three essential parts are: "the Bible should be read as much as possible", "the longest time should be given to prayer", and "the congregation should be offered the opportunity of taking part, actively and vocally, both as a body and as individuals". Consequently the conductor's addresses are reduced in length. As John Donne quaintly remarks about this occasion, "some thought it to be their duty to continue preaching until their auditory awoke". Clergy are also spared the ordeal of speaking two hours out of three. The pattern resembles the festival of nine lessons. Great attention is paid to the value of silence. Admittance and exit are only allowed during the pause for a hymn. A completely timed and typed programme is placed in the porch for the benefit of those unable to enjoy the full period in church. This manual should find wide acceptance and prove to be invaluable in its field.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

THE COMFORTABLE WORDS.

By W. W. S. March. (Mowbray.) 130 pp. 7s. 6d.

The sub-title to this useful little manual is "a pastoral and theological commentary" and many preachers will be grateful for it. New vistas are opened up by its reverent treatment of a familiar liturgical formula, especially in a decade when Prayer Book experiments are in vogue. As there is no parallel to this section of the Communion Service in the ancient liturgies, it is good to learn the source of it, and the reason for its introduction into the Reformed rite. The Foreword, by the Bishop of Knaresborough, warns us of "the shape of things to come" and the need for such a study. Six chapters examine the themes suggested by the Comfortable Words. Perhaps the introductory chapter on the source of the section in the liturgy is the most interesting. The other four outlining the meaning of the texts in this setting of Advent, Love, Death, and Glory are following well defined paths. The key phrase "Comfortable Words" is itself scriptural (Zech. i. 12-17), but most hearers of it will be ignorant of its origin. The formula was first used in the liturgy in 1541 by Hermann von Wied, the archbishop-elector of Cologne, in his Order for Public Worship. Cranmer quarrelled with this stone from Germany and incorporated it in the First Prayer Book of 1549. With skill Mr. March answers the question concerning the devotional and doctrinal meaning of these words. A Barthian ring is heard in the exposition. Yet we are indebted to the author for this brief but suggestive work setting forth the credal unity of the Comfortable Words, with its summary of the entire redemptive work of God: In the final chapter, entitled "Sursum Corda", church traditions will determine whether we accept his conclusions. But we shall at least agree with Brother Edward that our Lord constantly looked up to heaven. "Very few English people do, I fancy; we pray down our sleeves a great deal, as if they were telephones." This book will help us to make the right orientation in worship.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

THE APOCALYPSE TODAY.

By Thomas F. Torrance. (James Clarke.) 188 pp. 13s. 6d.

The Book of the Revelation never ceases to attract the attention of individuals and congregations, and sermons based upon it have a strange and uplifting power in them. These attempts by Dr. Torrance to instruct his former congregations at Beechgrove, Aberdeen, and the Barony Church, Alyn, will be much appreciated by other ministers in lesser cures. At least they set a model of the kind of sermon to be attempted, at once both biblical and expository with the elevation of Christ as the main end in view. Dr. Torrance received his initial impetus to expound the book from reading Johannes Lüthi's sermons on Daniel, and the broadcast addresses of the late Karl Ludwig Schmidt on the Apocalypse. Throughout these simple discourses he has endeavoured to make them relevant to the world in which we live today. Evidently he holds to the traditional authorship of the book. Sixteen chapters outline the contents of the Apocalypse, with a short epilogue on the Water of Life. The text of the Bible is printed before the

exegesis so that the reader is provided with a self-contained manual which may be carried easily in the pocket while travelling. Perhaps the most crucial chapter is that entitled "The Silver Lining" which sets forth Rev. xx. It might fairly be taken as a sample of the rest, and a clue given to the school of interpretation which Dr. Torrance follows. The time factor is measured out in its span by mysterious symbolical language because "God's time is different from our own", which is subjected to vanity and "unmeaning circularity". God's time is perfect in duration and complete in itself. The apocalyptic symbol of one thousand years expresses the fulness of time. (A misprint appears on p. 164—"capacity" for "incapacity".) The millennium is Christ's reign in the midst of time. "Behind the course of sinful history the reign of Christ is actually taking place." This book will be most satisfying to the contemporary school of interpreters.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

PAUL AND HIS PREDECESSORS.

By A. M. Hunter. (S.C.M.) 154 pp. 15s.

The face of New Testament criticism has been considerably altered in the past quarter-century by the particular attention which has been paid to the substrata of the New Testament, and a corresponding realization of the hazards involved in resting theories of authorship (for example) any longer upon arguments of literary dependence. The work of C. H. Dodd and P. Carrington, amongst others in this field, is today well known : but A. M. Hunter's book on the issue in its Pauline setting, which has just been revised and re-issued, was really at its first appearance in 1940 a pioneer work.

This new edition has given Dr. Hunter the opportunity of adding an appendix, in which he brings the discussion up to date, admits modifications, but shows that the further work done by other scholars in this area has simply strengthened his own conclusions. His original investigations were designed to illustrate the loyalty of St. Paul to the apostolic tradition, and indeed to the teaching of Jesus Himself. Carefully sifting the evidence, he reveals the strong underlying link that exists between Paul and his antecedents, appearing in the Pauline *corpus* in the form of *kerygma*, *paradosis*, credal formulae, hymns, *logia*, *catechesis*, *testimonia*, sacramental theology, christology, pneumatology, and eschatology.

The significant conclusion is that Paul, so far from being an "arch-innovator, or even corrupter, of the Christian faith" (p. 116), is a faithful witness to the apostolic tradition, as well as an original proponent of it. In the course of this masterly study, Dr. Hunter has given every student of the New Testament an important, well-documented book he will not wish to be without.

S. S. SMALLEY.

WAS CHRIST'S DEATH A SACRIFICE?

By Markus Barth. (Oliver and Boyd.) 55 pp. 7s. 6d.

Writers on the atonement have a tendency to adopt an all-or-nothing attitude towards sacrifice. Sometimes they regard sacrifice as the clue to the whole, and find everything else as fitting in under the sacrificial

category. Sometimes they regard it as a concept already outworn by New Testament times, so that the references in the New Testament have no great significance. Markus Barth's essay is an emphatic protest against the latter position. Indeed he goes so far as to accuse those who neglect the sacrificial as being near to the Ebionites (p. 8). He draws attention to the extent and the importance of the interpretation of Christ's death as a sacrifice, finding this in Paul and in John and in the Synoptics. All this is to be warmly welcomed by those who want to see biblical teaching rightly expounded.

But in some respects this is a disappointing book for all that. The author rejects views which regard sacrifice basically as gift, expiation, or communion, at least as regards the New Testament, and prefers to think of it as prayer. Such a revolutionary idea ought to be argued with seriousness, but this is not done. Again, sacrifice is usually regarded as vicarious, but the author does not discuss this. It is impossible to say whether he holds to a vicarious sacrifice or not. Serious also is his confusion of redemption and sacrificial atonement in the New Testament ("they retain different names but mean one and the same", p. 30). The evidence will hardly bear this out. The two categories are distinct, though both may be applied to Christ's atoning work. Nor do I like his uncritical acceptance of Dodd's view that the Bible means "expiation" when it says "propitiation". The work of those who oppose this view should at least be noted.

LEON MORRIS.

CRIME BEFORE CALVARY.

By Guy Schofield. (Harrap.) 240 pp. 21s.

This book is an attempt at historical reconstruction, centred upon the part which Herodias played in influencing the policy of Herod Antipas as it affected first John the Baptist and then Jesus Christ. Mr. Schofield has provided a vivid and interesting interpretation, though it must be said at once that his theory depends at a number of points, some of them important, upon hypothesis. The author has sought to revise many of the established views about leading characters in the Gospel narrative. In fact, he insists a trifle wearisomely on this work of correction. He presents Herodias as a powerful, determined woman, working upon a Herod cautious and moderate, a fairly competent ruler in contrast with the traditional lecherous tyrant of "Oscar Wildean nightmare". Certainly some correction was to be welcomed here. The new view of Pilate is more startling and more difficult to accept, though one must admit the strength of such evidence as Mr. Schofield brings. Pilate is seen not as a weak or as a careless character, but as vicious and cynical, insulting and despising the race he governed, "a man of very inflexible disposition and very merciless, as well as very obstinate".

The treatment of some of the incidents is interesting. Mr. Schofield suggests, for example, that John the Baptist in prison at Machaerus received very favoured consideration; and, again, he sees the revolt against Pilate's introduction of the Imperial images into Jerusalem as a kind of first-century equivalent of a present-day anti-nuclear passive resistance sit-down protest.

It is a pity that the book is marred by so much careless spelling and punctuation or else proof-reading.

ARTHUR POLLARD.

TOLERANCE AND THE INTOLERABLE : THE SWARTHMORE LECTURE FOR 1961.

By Richard K. Ullmann. (Allen & Unwin.) 74 pp. 8s. 6d. (5s. paper.)

For anyone in need of a sympathetic insight into the Quaker way of life nothing could be simpler yet more profound than this book, illustrated by choice quotations from writers ancient and modern. The author has been baptized into the subject through the anguish of persecution during the Nazi régime. His wide contact with other civilizations in the Far East has acclimatized him to many different outlooks. Originally a Lutheran, his experience of refuge in England among the Friends introduced him to a new way of life, which he so ably presents to the intelligent reader in these pages. The problem which he discusses is this : can we stand for truth in the face of falsehood without being intolerant ? In five short chapters he outlines his thesis.

Quakerism stands for the liberty of conscience, seen when that conscience is not fully enlightened, and hopes that the influence of the enlightened will lead the deluded into fuller truth. The inner light within man is the chief authority in matters of guidance as it expresses the Universal Light of Christ shining in every man which comes into the world. We are called to respect that spiritual essence and to abstain from persecution, or coercion of any kind, when some brother walks against the inner witness. Through personal prejudice and group pressure it is never easy to achieve. From every conceivable angle the subject is discussed. The vicious chain of circumstances that binds us all, as well as the limitations of humanity, is taken into account. Truth is vital and must be declared, but never forced upon another, and the witness must be prepared to die, if need be, to prove his love of the truth. Love is the solvent of all differences whether found in friend or foe. This is the message conveyed by the life and death of Jesus Christ. The Quaker is called to endure to the end, exhibit dignity in his suffering, and pray for those who despitefully use him. Only thus can the Holy Spirit of Truth and Love live on in defeat, and rise victorious over all suffering. The book is worthy of a wide circulation.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

THE SAVAGE MY KINSMAN.

By Elizabeth Elliot. (Hodder & Stoughton.) 159 pp. 37s. 6d.

A reviewer in a literary weekly sneered at the recent Auca book, *The Dayuma Story*, on the ground that Dayuma's version of Bible stories debased Christianity to a level barely recognizable. He should read this new Auca book, especially the section on the difficulties of communication, and be shamed.

More serious is the feeling that the Auca episode is being exploited to the last dollar. This latest book should kill that, though it's a wry comment on modern Christendom that it has taken a naked, murderous

tribe, barely two hundred strong, to make missionary literature sell widely again.

The Savage My Kinsman is Betty Elliot's account of the ten or eleven months which she, her little girl, and Rachel Saint spent with the killers of Jim Elliot and Nate Saint, in complete isolation except for air drops and radio. A magnificent book, both for family use and serious reading, being not only an album of excellent and unusual photographs, but a factual, unemotional and highly observant account of an experience that needed a high degree of courage and of faith ("If a duty is clear, the dangers surrounding it are irrelevant" . . . "I seized on [the words of a psalm], acted on them, and in acting discovered the Rock beneath" . . . "For everything that I would have called an inconvenience there was compensation if I took the time to look for it and had the grace to be grateful").

Mrs. Elliot's account of the Aucas and their language is an important contribution to anthropology and linguistics. Her discovery that "socially I had nothing whatever to offer to the Aucas" is described in a moving account of a "savage" culture that had its own beauty, its own moral standards, but a total lack of recognition of spiritual need. She learned that to bring them Christ we must come, "not to be benefactors, but servants". Her words should be proclaimed a watchword for all missionaries.

This book is not dear. The Christian reading public needs a more realistic attitude to prices.

J. C. POLLOCK.

THE PRISONER LEAPS : A DIARY OF MISSIONARY LIFE IN JAVA.

By David Bentley-Taylor. (*China Inland Mission.*) 352 pp.
17s. 6d.

Ten years ago, when it became clear that the presence of missionaries on the mainland of China was becoming a hindrance, or even a menace, to the Chinese Church, there were those who urged that the China Inland Mission, having "exhausted the mandate of Heaven" (to quote the phrase used as one dynasty gave way to another in China), should now disintegrate, its members returning to their home countries and seeking a ministry there. It was then that as an alternative we began to explore the extent of the unmet need in the countries of south-east Asia, stretching in a wide arc from Thailand to Japan. If we could be regarded as authorities on things Chinese, we were painfully ignorant of conditions in these other fields. But our survey teams reported that, not only amongst the Chinese in south-east Asia but also amongst the indigenous peoples, there were many millions who had never been evangelized. Today the C.I.M., under its new name the Overseas Missionary Fellowship, is at work in a dozen of these fields, and after ten years it is a suitable time to assess the progress made. This is what Mr. Bentley-Taylor does in regard to Indonesia, which had always been virtually the "preserve" of missionaries from Holland.

But *The Prisoner Leaps* is by no means a statistical survey of what has been accomplished, either by the Dutch missions or by the tiny group from the C.I.M. Indeed, it is more valuable, and much more fascinating, than any survey could be. While Mr. Bentley-Taylor

presents a day-to-day record of his experiences in recent years, and one can glean a good deal of information concerning the peoples of Java and Sumatra, the churches established, and the vastness of the unmet need, the book is perhaps chiefly remarkable for its portrait of a man of God referred to as "Rufus", a Javanese evangelist of only average attainments whom the Spirit of God is using in turning many Muslims to a vital faith in Christ. By God's grace Mr. Bentley-Taylor has bridged between the westerner and this eastern prophet, and the two are working together in double harness with glorious results. Rufus might well be termed—for those who are familiar with C.I.M. literature—the "Pastor Hsi" of Indonesia.

FRANK HOUGHTON, Bishop.

GOD'S PEOPLE IN INDIA.

By John Webster Grant. (Highway Press.) 112 pp. 6s.

As Bishop Newbigin points out in his Foreword, this book is "a valuable study of the Christian Church in India". The Rev. J. W. Grant is a minister in the United Church of Canada, who was visiting professor at the United College of South India and Ceylon in the year 1957-58. During that time he travelled widely, and gleaned material for this sober yet sympathetic appraisal of the situation which "God's people in India" are facing. (Incidentally, that is how the New English Bible would describe them. Thus "The church of God which is at Corinth" becomes "The congregation of God's people at Corinth".) Mr. Grant is impressed with "the greatness of God's mighty acts" in India, but also with "the need of imparting a more Indian character to the outlook and customs of the Church, while avoiding any dilution of the Gospel or any blunting of its moral demands". That sentence makes it clear how balanced a view Mr. Grant takes of the line along which all who love India should be concerned that progress should be made. The influence of nationalism, the danger of syncretism, the need of voluntary lay witness by church members, the new attitudes which missionaries from overseas must adopt if they are to fulfil their ministry—these are a few of the vital questions which Mr. Grant discusses with clarity, spiritual discernment, and a burning love.

FRANK HOUGHTON, Bishop.

THE RELIGIONS OF TIBET.

By Helmut Hoffmann. Translated by Edward Fitzgerald. (Allen & Unwin.) 200 pp. 25s.

The Religions of Tibet was published in Germany in 1956, and has only this year appeared in its English form. The author is Professor of Indology in Munich, and as a result of long investigation, and extensive travels in the region of the Himalayas, he has acquired a formidable fund of knowledge concerning the origins of Tibetan religions. It is not easy for the general reader to share the enthusiasm with which he has burrowed into the voluminous literature concerning the rise and progress and decline of the ancient Bon religion, animist and Shamanist, whose hold upon the peoples of Tibet was slowly undermined by the entrance of Buddhism from India. The ancient kings of Tibet

eventually gave place to the rule of the priests. Thus in the fourteenth century there was "a more and more blatant urge on the part of the priesthood towards temporal power", accompanied by "the predominance of magical arts according to Tantric rituals". It seems doubtful whether Professor Hoffmann is aware of the general corruption of Lamaism down to the present day, and there is no evidence of any Christian grief over the gross superstitions which have held captive the people of Tibet. One is not even certain whether the ethical standards of Tibetan religions matter to him. Writing, for instance, of the Bon mystics, and their endeavour to achieve "unification with the original basic essence", he says that this essence "contains both good and evil—on this high stage they have both become pointless" (p. 107). He seems to be attracted by the Buddhist sage Mi-la, who "had to raise himself to a stage in which neither sin nor virtue was of any significance" (p. 152). Yet in the myths of the Bon religion he finds parallels with (for example) the story of Simeon at the birth of Jesus (p. 87), "the Christian parable of the vine" (p. 93), and "Jesus promising the coming of the Paraclete". One is reminded of the story of Mr. J. H. Edgar, a member of the China Inland Mission who made a carefully anthropological study of certain tribes on the Tibetan border of China. Having lectured to a group of learned anthropologists and having listened to the discussion which followed, he was constrained at last to break in with the words, "Gentlemen, you seem to be concerned only with where these people came *from*—I am concerned with where they are going *to*!"

With Communism at present triumphing in Tibet, and the Dalai Lama an exile in India, what is the future of its peoples? Will Communism break the age-long power of Lamaism? When shall the saving Gospel of Jesus Christ prevail over them both? We may at least accept the statement with which this book ends, "It is not yet possible to determine the exact features of a highly problematical future"—though we know that the ultimate future is with God.

FRANK HOUGHTON, Bishop.

THE OCHRE ROBE.

*By Swami Agehananda Bharati. (Allen and Unwin.) 294 pp.
25s.*

The real name of Swami Agehananda Bharati is Herr Leopold Fischer, a thirty-seven year old Viennese. From boyhood he had a passion for all things Indian and Hindu. As a step towards fulfilment he joined Hitler's pathetic Indian Legion of deserters, and succeeded in hoodwinking his Allied captors, for some months, that he was an Indian.

He went to India in 1948 and became an acolyte of the Ramakrishnan Order of Renaissance Hinduism; later he was an itinerant monk, then professor of philosophy at Banaras Hindu University, and now pursues his learning in conditions of comfort at the University of Washington, Seattle.

Mr. Fischer writes, in excellent English, an unusual autobiography. Unfortunately, there is too big a slice of bumptious schoolboy and arrogant (if amusing) undergraduate in his make up, and for all his Indian ways he is patently three-fifths European in outlook still.

Little of the real atmosphere of India comes through the pages, and his contribution to the religious understanding is very much what would be expected of a man bred in a skin-deep Roman Catholicism who turned philosophic-Hindu.

J. C. POLLOCK.

THE CONCEPT OF MAN : A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE PHILOSOPHY.

Edited by S. Radhakrishnan and P. T. Raju. (Allen & Unwin.) 383 pp. 42s.

What is Man? Answers to this question are gathered together by four philosophers, each representing different traditions of thought Greek, Jewish, Chinese, and Indian. It is an interesting experience to read what these writers have to say on a topic upon which Christian thought has said so much. There are but slight references made, and then only incidentally, to Christian thinking, on the concept of man. Yet there emerges a unity, in spite of the differences, as man is seen to be not simply a natural object, but also a subject at once moral, rational, and spiritual. The section of Indian thought is nearly twice as long as each of the others and is given in great detail, with a multiplicity of terms that can be bewildering. This is the work of Professor Raju of Rajasthan University, Jodhpur, India, who also contributes an introduction and a concluding chapter on comparisons and reflections.

Briefly, Jewish thought on man is mainly theological and ethical. Man is called to be holy and righteous as God is. The ideal man for the Greeks is the lover of wisdom. Their chief concern is for rationality. The sage, who is humanistic, is the Chinese ideal. In Indian thought, the saint, is the ideal of all men. All the great themes of religion and philosophy are passed in review, man and nature, in society, in relation to the Divine Spirit ; as viewed by contemporary science ; in his individuality and in relation to his ideals. These make an absorbing study. It is good to have these strands of thought within the pages of one book and to see the good in them all. For completion they need the religion of the Incarnation, with its roots in history, and its factual representation of the Ideal Man. Otherwise the hunger of natural religion remains unappeased.

A. V. McCALLIN.

REASON AND GOODNESS.

By Brand Blanshard. (Allen & Unwin.) 451 pp. 42s.

Based on the Gifford Lectures of St. Andrews and the Noble Lectures at Harvard, and one of the Muirhead Library of Philosophy, this book is the second of a trilogy in praise of reason, by the Sterling Professor of Philosophy in Yale University. As its title implies it deals with moral theory. The age-long tension between reason and feeling in ethics is thoroughly analysed, especially as it shows itself today. The theories of subjectivists of the logical positivist school, deontologists of the intuitive school, and others are scrutinized and shown to be inadequate. All this occupies more than half of the book and is superbly reasoned, with the arguments made as simple as possible for the reader by the use of frequent well-chosen illustrations of actual moral situations.

Dr. Blanshard's positive theory owes much to the Greek temper of mind, especially the teleological viewpoint of Aristotle. All turns upon the objectivity of value. As human nature is examined empirically, we are aware of a dialectic of impulse-desire, which leads to the supremacy of reason, in both knowledge and morals. The conclusion is reached that The Good is that which both *fulfils* impulse-desire and *satisfies* wholly. A real judgment is always presupposed. Reason is more than reasoning, or even human reason. It is coherence—the universal Reason—from which everything derives.

It is an enrichment of mind and spirit to read this truly great book. Incidentally, though Kant is often referred to in the text his name does not appear in the index. In this "someone has blundered".

A. V. M'CALLIN.

THE LONELY HEART : THE ANSWER TO THE PROBLEM OF LONELINESS THROUGH LIFE.

By Cyril H. Powell. (Arthur James.) 174 pp. 12s. 6d.

This is one of the most helpful books on the great problem of loneliness that a Christian is likely to find. There are more formal analyses and snappier books on fellowship, but Dr. Powell has exactly the right balance for the person who wants an intellectual and an emotional approach. He knows his psychology and he knows people. In Part I he follows through life from childhood to old age, showing the ways in which every sort of loneliness can attack us, including the loneliness in the crowd, the loneliness of being different, and the loneliness through the experiences that come in middle life. The frequent illustrations are both of loneliness and of ways in which people have overcome it. Part II is less systematic. Entitled "Loneliness and Man", it takes up such things as work, bereavement, and temptation (especially the loneliness that comes through feeling that our temptations are unique). Part III rounds off the book with the answers that the Christian finds in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and in the fellowship of the Church.

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT.

ALONE TO PRAY.

By Brian Hession. (Peter Davies.) 208 pp. 16s.

Has anyone ever tried to discover what proportion of a Christian congregation use a book of prayers in their personal quiet times? My impression is that most evangelicals prefer to pray spontaneously, but there is a lot to be said for turning to a book from time to time in order to widen our vision. Brian Hession's book is stimulating for meditative praying, and includes some occasions and thoughts which would not naturally occur to us as relevant for prayer. Most of the prayers are his own; some are familiar to us from other books. The pattern of each page is normally a subject, a text, and a meditative prayer. There are some 115 pages of this sort, after which there are prayers for corporate use and some passages from Scripture.

The price and format put the book in the luxury class, which is a great pity, since it thus becomes the sort of book that one gives as a present rather than buys for use.

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT.

**THE MYSTICAL LIFE : AN OUTLINE OF ITS NATURE AND TEACHINGS
FROM THE EVIDENCE OF DIRECT EXPERIENCE.**

By J. H. M. Whiteman. (Faber.) 250 pp. 30s.

CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM AND SUBUD.

By J. G. Bennett. (Institute for the Comparative Study of History, Philosophy, and the Sciences, Kingston-on-Thames.) 69 pp. 10s.

Dr. Whiteman's book is of a most unusual type. He has had strange inner-world experiences, which he has carefully recorded, and which he here links up with the writings of mystics and psychical researchers. Professor H. H. Price writes a considerable introduction from the standpoint of a philosopher who is also an expert in psychical research. One would have welcomed a further introduction by a depth psychologist in the light of some of the "dreams" that are related in the book.

Dr. Whiteman breaks down his experiences into analysable forms. Thus he makes a broad distinction between dreams and out-of-the-body separations, and further distinguishes grades of separation. On so-called astral projection I found him less impressive than Muldoon, and it looks as though the author is aware only of Muldoon and Carrington's third book, which is a poor thing compared with their *Projection of the Astral Body*. Most of Dr. Whiteman's experiences are of dissociation from the channels of the physical senses, and at times he seems to be experiencing suppressed fragments of himself that temporarily assume control or try to impose themselves upon "him". This would accord with McDougall's monadic theory of personality (p. 81). The goal of mysticism is more than this, and Dr. Whiteman speaks of the Vision of Archetypal Light, which has been described by mystics of various creeds and which he himself has experienced.

It is likely that here and overseas we shall hear more about *Subud*, which is a contraction from three Sanskrit words meaning Right living guided by the Higher Self of Man, in fulfilment of the will or law of God. It was founded by Pak Subuh in Java in 1934. At least two books have been written about it in this country, one by Mr. Bennett himself. Mr. Bennett is known as an exponent of Gurdjieff and Ouspensky, but finds in Subud the fulfilment of his teachings. Subud tends to crash the barrier into inner-world experiences, and in this little book Mr. Bennett frankly discusses how far these experiences are natural, supernatural, and true experiences of God. He faces the dangers of passivity and quietism, and, unlike some writers on occult themes, is aware of the heart of the Christian message.

Those who wish to explore the inner-world of man, with a view to assessing experiences commonly classed as religious, will find help in both of these books.

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT.

GO TO HEAVEN.

By Fulton J. Sheen. (Peter Davies.) 221 pp. 16s.

Bishop Sheen writes for the few remaining unchurched Americans—with constant glances over his shoulder at Protestant objectors.

The style is smooth and enticing, and the content is as acceptable as Roman Catholicism could ever be made to be. It is still the same Rome, however. The unsuspecting inquirer will swallow almost without noticing it the apotheosis of the Roman Communion as the extension of the Incarnation. Tetzel would perhaps not have recognized Sheen's Purgatory (if he ever rose high enough to see it), but the transfer of human merit still underlies it. And although there is much about personal religion and morality, this very emphasis betrays Sheen's presuppositions. He is trying to lacquer a surface of grace on to a bedrock of unaccommodating Pelagianism. His touch is nearly clever enough to conceal the essential incompatibility of his materials—but not quite. He remains a most convincing apologist for his Church's syncretistic plan of salvation.

COLIN BUCHANAN.

THE DIARY OF A MISFIT PRIEST.

By W. Rowland Jones. (Allen & Unwin.) 190 pp. 25s.

This book is racy, readable, and rubbishy. Rowland Jones was brought up a Methodist, was ordained in 1920 by Hensley Henson, spent forty years in an Anglican wilderness of his own devising, and has now returned to a Methodist ministry. In 1928 he was " validly " ordained by an *episcopus vagans* (the account of this is reminiscent of *Punch*) and then assisted Dr. W. E. Orchard for some years at King's Weigh House. Here his inveterate cynicism (unhappily wedded to extreme Roman practices) induced him to trick Dr. Orchard into worshipping an empty ciborium ; Now he flagrantly mocks the Anglo-Catholicism he so long professed, and his methods are unscholarly and highly offensive.

He sees bishops as an integral feature of Anglicanism and turns his " diary " into a furious *ad homines* onslaught. The last four chapters appear to have been written, proof-read, and published all in a single evening. Under analysis only one bishop (apart from the eccentric *vagans*) was less than kind to him, and he himself left a sea of trouble everywhere. The book is a rambling rationalization of his own dishonesty, disloyalty, and profound cynicism. A few blows are shrewd, and humour abounds—but not thus did he gain his Ph.D.

COLIN BUCHANAN.

RECEIVING THE WORD OF GOD.

By R. E. Terwilliger. (Mowbray.) 147 pp. 5s.

This book was chosen by the Bishop of New York for his Lent book, 1960. It endeavours to deal with the question of how the Word of God is received by the believer, and how it can be more effectively received, through the mediums of the Bible, the liturgy, preaching, and devotional study. The treatment of the theme is essentially from the stand-point of the receiver. The author is a scholar of theological merit and rector of Christ Church, Poughkeepsie, New York. A foreword is written by the Bishop and four chapters are devoted to Jesus the Word of God, receiving the Word of God in the Bible, in the liturgy, and in preaching, and there is a useful epilogue entitled The Word of God in

the Christian. The book gives indications of indebtedness to English, Continental, and American scholars, but especially to Karl Barth. The average congregation would get a pithy evaluation of Barthianism through these talks, and the reader by means of these pages. This is both the strength and weakness of the approach to the question. Too much is made of the decisive moment when God speaks. Too little is made of the Written Word of God. The author does not explain "how each book of the Bible may be rightly read, or even how each type of book should be approached". One of the significant omissions is reference to the work of the Holy Spirit. Certainly we are treated in full measure to contemporary theology with all its values, and with all its vices. Yet for all this so much shines through the confusion which is of lasting worth and sufficiently "Gospel" to give the book an air of reality and authority. We have still a long way to go to a truer understanding of the subject.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

SACRAMENT, SACRIFICE, AND EUCHARIST : THE MEANING, FUNCTION, AND USE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

By A. M. Stibbs. (*Tyndale Press.*) 93 pp. 5s.

Notwithstanding that this book has been published by a non-Anglican publishing house, it is, throughout, a sober attempt to assess and speak to the Anglican situation. The author points out in his Preface that a matter which so vitally touches the theory and practice of Christian unity must concern all denominations alike. None the less, though every reader, of whatever affiliation, will be stimulated and challenged by these pages, members of the Church of England will be in no doubt that theirs is the greatest debt to Mr. Stibbs for this book.

The composition of the book is clarity itself : the first three chapters review the past and present emphases in controversy over the Lord's Supper, noting the basic similarities and differences between the older teaching on "the sacrifice of the Mass" and the more recent teaching under the label "Eucharistic Sacrifice". Next the "Basic Issue"—the double test of the Bible as a whole, and the content of the Gospel in particular—is stated, and following this the book launches on the positive statement of sacramental doctrine : the meaning of the Finished Work of Christ ; an exposition of "Do this", "remembrance," and "ye do proclaim" ; how, in the Holy Communion, we may obtain the benefits of Christ's Passion ; what is a True Eucharist ; how Christ's presence is to be realized. The final chapter touches on matters of administration.

It is not always possible to complain of the brevity of a book, but in this case one does rather cry for more. In many ways what we have here is not so much a completed task as the extended outline of a larger book yet to be written. In particular it would have been advantageous to read a more elaborated statement of past and present controversies in the opening chapters. Admittedly, what has been written clarifies the main issues, and for this one can only be grateful, but further exposition and enlargement would have served to make the good better.

In the positive exposition of the Lord's Supper contained in the central chapters—in every way the meat of the book—Mr. Stibbs has met a long felt need. Evangelicals have produced full and plenty of literature for the inquirer, making the way of salvation clear, pointing the way ahead for the young Christian, but very little to help the communicant. Here the matter is helpfully and unambiguously dealt with, and, if any minister feels that the going is too hard for his newly-confirmed members, then let him take the chapters and break them up small in his confirmation classes. Evangelicals are hurt when charged with making little of the Lord's Supper ; here is the teaching which will help us to make much of it, for our own soul's welfare.

It would not be surprising if the chapter on Administration provoked a good deal of comment. Here again it would have been most welcome to have the matter set forth more extensively. In loyalty to our Lord's words and actions in the Institution, we ought to have "thanksgiving" for the bread and wine separately, and "these thanksgivings should be regarded as the consecration" (p. 84) ; the words "This is my body" should be restored to their proper use as words of administration ; all should receive the bread before any receive the wine. As regards ministry, there is no reason whatever why the conduct of the sacramental service should be reserved for an "ordained" ministry rather than performed by elders appointed by the congregation ; the table should be brought into the body of the church ; there should always be a ministry of the Word ; "qualification to partake ought to be determined, not by one's attachment to a particular denomination, but directly by one's personal relation to Christ our Lord" (p. 86).

This book, with clarity and where necessary with a refreshing polemic, faces us with the fact that Evangelical truth concerning the Lord's Supper is not an optional "insight", but is the only view which accords with Scripture. It remains to be seen whether Evangelicals will be granted the will and zeal to respond to Mr. Stibbs' call for united and determined action within the next twelve months. God grant it may be so !

J. A. MOTYER.

THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

By James Buchanan. (Banner of Truth.) 528 pp. 15s.

It is nearly 100 years since Buchanan's great work first appeared. It was written with a strong sense of urgency, not only to inform but to warn a careless generation of the dangers which attend the neglect of vital doctrines. Much has happened in that century to fulfil the writer's suggestion of what might be the course of events if such neglect continued, and to the reader of today his warning comes as clear as ever. "What renders this 'sign of the times' all the more significant and ominous is the additional fact that all these attacks on the cardinal doctrine of the Reformation, from whatever quarter they have proceeded . . . have invariably had one and the same aim and direction—a return, in substance, if not in form, to the corrupt doctrine of the Church of Rome."

There is so much ignorance of the Roman reaction to the Reformers'

work in making this doctrine the biblical keystone of Protestantism, that Lecture V, entitled "The Romish Church after the Reformation", might well be made the basis of serious study by those seeking to inform themselves for coming controversies, and not least by the students in our Evangelical colleges. Any who are following carefully the present trend of events in the Church of England, and in particular the overtures to Rome, will immediately be struck by the contemporary flavour of the author's statements in this section. There is still an "Old Popery" and a "New Popery", the latter "intended . . . for their Protestant neighbours, in which all the grosser features of Popery are concealed, or softened down, or coloured over, and all its distinctive doctrines kept in the background or explained away."

This volume, which includes a masterly introductory essay by Dr. J. I. Packer, is essential reading for all who value and seek to maintain the fruits of the Reformation.

JOHN GOSS.

THE IMPORTANCE OF UNDERSTANDING : TRANSLATIONS FROM THE CHINESE.

By Lin Yutang. (Heinemann.) 494 pp. 25s.

Dr. Lin Yutang, who has taught at universities in America and Germany as well as in his native China, is known for his ability to bridge the gulf between Western and Oriental culture. This book contains translations he has made of over a hundred pieces in poetry and prose which reflect the Chinese way of life down the ages. Many of them have not previously appeared in English. They are neatly arranged and, granted the comparatively narrow range of Chinese literature, cover a wide field.

Essentially this is a bedtime book, not to be read consecutively but dipped into here and there. The prose translations read smoothly. Some of the poetry is rather less happy, in particular the opening pieces which are close enough in spirit and in metre to Omar Khayyam to cause the slightly off-beat lines and sentiments to jar. Dr. Yutang may be more accurate in his translations than Arthur Waley, but his verse does not match the quality of that past master's.

Though some of the pieces may contain superficial resemblances to Western writers, such as Horace, there is a certain passivity about them—full of wit, but almost devoid of humour—which is alien to the Western, and above all to the Christian, way of life. This element of passivity seems to contain the clue to the basic dilemma of the Chinese world. Outwardly the Chinese littérateur is a man of calm: his philosophy seems to be the solution for the troubled mind; but inwardly there is an unresolved conflict between the enjoyment of intellectual pleasures and the sense that duty calls to a life of helping one's fellow-men. Almost like Plato's philosopher-king, the mandarin is driven from the cave to the light and back again. The Christian conception of love as the mainspring of thought and action shows the way to resolving the conflict, but the problem remains a real one for the Christian. In communicating to Western readers the reality of this and other aspects of Chinese thought, Dr. Yutang has rendered a conspicuous service.

J. D. TAYLOR THOMPSON.

CHRISTIAN DISCOURSES.

By Soren Kierkegaard. Translated by Walter Lowrie. (Oxford University Press.) 389 pp. 11s. 6d.

The American translation of Kierkegaard begun before the war is making an encore in paperbacks. The present volume contains several discourses written about the time of Kierkegaard's religious "metamorphosis" in 1848. Here is Kierkegaard at his least philosophical and his most straightforward. The tantalizing hide-and-seek of his earlier pseudonymous works has been dropped. Hegel, the arch-villain of the earlier philosophical writings, is nowhere to be seen. We are left simply with Kierkegaard himself appearing as a witness for Christianity.

Despite the high praises lavished upon him in recent years, Kierkegaard seems really to have only two things to say. The one is the assertion that truth is not *what* we know but *how* we know. You may know all the strokes in theory, but you will never learn to swim unless you take the plunge. Kierkegaard admits only one proof of Christianity: you must try it for yourself. When pushed to extremes, as Kierkegaard almost certainly did in his less devotional utterances, this view replaces the Jesus of history by a Jesus of faith. It does not matter whether the events of the Bible really did happen so long as we act as if they did. Small wonder that Kierkegaard is regarded as the great-grandfather of modern atheistic existentialism.

The other thing that Kierkegaard has to say (and the present volume takes close on 400 pages to say it) is the rather obvious platitude that formal, nominal Christianity is not Christianity at all. To this end Kierkegaard pokes and prods us. He screams at the top of his shrill voice. He whispers behind our ear, until we realize that we are the Pharisees, and that our only hope is to throw ourselves on the mercy of God.

Elsewhere, Kierkegaard described his work as a corrective, "Just a bit of cinnamon!" As an exercise in excruciating self-examination some will find Kierkegaard helpful. Others will simply find him excruciatingly long-winded. But Kierkegaard was right. Because of his limited scope he could never hope to be more than "a bit of cinnamon". We must look elsewhere if we want the whole gospel. But we must be thankful for what he has given us. After all, we can't expect to live on a diet of cinnamon!

COLIN BROWN.